Par. S.2.1.1.52
836

Volume I
No. 1 — 21

Thursday
12th June, 1952

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

(Part I - Questions and Answers)

CONTENTS

Members Sworn [Cols. 2—18].

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Dated......18.11.2011

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part I—Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 12th June, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

BHAKRA CONTROL BOARD

*735. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bhakra Control Board decided to recruit experts from the U.S.A. for construction of the Bhakra Dam;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Vice-Chairman of the Board visited U.S.A. twice to make final selection of experts for this project; and

(c) what was the expenditure incurred during these visits?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No, Sir. The Vice-Chairman of the Board visited the U.S.A. only once in this connection.

(c) Rs. 14,900 approximately.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Have those experts arrived on the spot or not yet?

Shri Nanda: Some have. They have already recruited eight specialists out of the number that they required.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is it a fact that one of these experts is the highest paid official in the world?

Shri Nanda: I have no information about all the experts in the world and as to what everyone draws.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is the Vice-Chairman again overseas during these days?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir, in another connection.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is it a fact that he called for tenders for construction of certain works in connection with the Bhakra Dam and when all the foreign firms had sent in their agents and submitted their tenders he decided to go himself overseas to select the firm to whom he would give the tender?

Shri Nanda: No. Sir. It is a different object for which the Vice-Chairman has gone—that is as far as my information goes.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Then what about that fact which I wanted to know, that is whether tenders had been called for construction of a part of this dam and tenders had been received and the foreign firms had also sent in their representatives? If those tenders had been received has any one been selected?

Shri Nanda: Tenders have been called for at different times and unless there is specific information as to what the hon. Member refers to I cannot give an answer.

Mr. Speaker: He refers to tenders for construction work.

Shri Nanda: At one time there was a proposal to give the contract for construction to a firm of construction agency. After mature consideration it was decided that the work should be done departmentally. If the hon. Member gives me notice of the specific tender I will give him the information.

Shri Meghnad Saha: May I know the name of the expert who was called to give opinion on this question?

Shri Nanda: The opinion of Mr. Savage was taken regarding the selection of the specialists to be recruited for the Bhakra-Nangal Dam.

Shri Damodara Menon: May I know, Sir, whether this recruitment could not have been made through our embassy in America?

Shri Nanda: It was found necessary that the Vice-Chairman should go personally. That was decided by the Control Board—after having made attempts by other means they found that it was necessary for the Vice-Chairman to go.

Shri Jhunjhunwala: What are the emoluments of these specialists and for what period have they been appointed?

Shri Nanda: Mr. Slowcombe has been appointed for a period of three years. Regarding the others the periods vary.

STEEL PLANT

*736. **Shri Velayudhan:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Japanese Industrial Missions which visited India proposed the starting of a steel plant in Madras; and

(b) if so, at what stage the matter stands at present?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri C. R. Narasimhan: Did the delegation visit Madras, Sir, and, if so, have they had any discussions there?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am not quite sure of the position. I would like notice.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether the mission had a talk with the Chief Minister of Madras with regard to the steel plant there and whether the Government of India is aware of that?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have no information.

Shri Nambiar: Is there any proposal at all to start a steel plant in Madras or anywhere in India with the help of the Japanese Mission?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The answer is the answer I gave to part (a) of the question—no.

TREATY WITH U.S.A.

*737. **Shri Velayudhan:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that India and the U.S.A. have reached agreement on the fundamental terms of a treaty of friendship, commerce and navigation?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Discussions have been going on intermittently for the last four years for a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation between India and the U.S.A. An agreement on several issues has been reached, but there are some other issues which have still to be considered. Negotiations to resolve these remaining points of difference are in progress.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know how long it will take for the final formulation of this treaty of friendship?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I suggest the hon. Member if he believes in astrology to go to an astrologer.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether a treaty of friendship on the lines mentioned by the Prime Minister will affect our dynamic neutrality?

Mr. Speaker: Order. order. Next question.

RELIEF SCHEME FOR DISPLACED PERSONS

*738. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government of India have sanctioned a relief scheme for displaced persons under which a person who left Post Office Savings Bank accounts in Pakistan or who held postal certificates for which payments have not yet been received will be eligible for monthly allowances;

(b) if so, what is the rate of the monthly allowance; and

(c) for how long that allowance would be payable?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). Persons having Post Office Savings Bank Accounts or Postal Cash Certificates with a balance or value not exceeding Rs. 1,000 will be paid Rs. 75 p.m. for a period of 6 months, or half the total deposit in six equal monthly instalments, whichever is less. Where such balances exceed Rs. 1.000. relief will be paid at the rate of Rs. 100 p.m. for a period of 6 months.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Has any decision been arrived at in regard to giving relief to those who held postal life insurance policies?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know what is the relief?

Shri A. P. Jain: Practically the same concession as had been given here.

Shri A. C. Guha: Has any agreement been reached between India and Pakistan as regards the payment of pensions, Provident Funds and National Savings Certificates?

Shri A. P. Jain: My hon. friend already knows that so far as East Bengal is concerned there is free traffic, and so far as the West is concerned we have been negotiating but the final settlement has not been made.

Shri A. C. Guha: There is also some difficulty as regards payment in East Bengal.

Shri A. P. Jain: I am not aware of it.

REHABILITATION LOANS

*739. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state whether any rehabilitation loans have been sanctioned by the Government of India to any State or States since January, 1952?

(b) If so, to which States have the loans been sanctioned?

(c) What are the amounts of loans given to those States?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 18.]

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the loans given to different States have been given for the same purpose or for different purposes?

Shri A. P. Jain: For the same purposes, that is: housing loans, urban loans and rural loans.

Shri N. B. Chowdhury: May I know what are the terms of repayment of these loans?

Shri A. P. Jain: A certain rate of interest is charged and the loans are recovered from the State Governments over a period of a number of years.

श्री आर० एन० सिंह : क्या मंत्री जी बतला सकते हैं कि किस स्टेट को कितना दिया गया?

[**Shri R. N. Singh:** Will he hon. Minister please give the amounts State-wise?]

श्री ए० पी० जैन : वह पूरी की पूरी इत्तला उस स्टेटमेंट में है जो कि मैं ने मेज़ पर रख दिया है ।

[**Shri A. P. Jain:** The information is given in full in the statement which I have laid on the Table of the House.]

Shri Namdhari: In view of the slump in the market, are Government prepared to consider the postponement of the recovery of refugees' debts, or adjust them later in the 10 per cent. payment due on account of their claims?

Shri A. P. Jain: I thought the hon. Member was aware of the Press Communique which has been issued and which has also been adequately broadcast.

Mr. Speaker: Next question.

HEAVY ELECTRIC PLANTS (IMPORT)

*740. **Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the number and value of licenses issued during the year 1951-52 for the import of Heavy Electric Plants; and

(b) the number and value of licenses actually availed of during the same period?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Records are maintained with reference to the two halves of the calendar year. During 1951, 988 licences for Rs. 25·74 crores were issued.

(b) Information is not available with the Government.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Were these parts imported under "heavy machinery" or "capital goods" or in some other category?

Shri Karmarkar: It refers to equipment and materials, for instance, switch gear, generators, alternators, dynamos, transformers, cables, wires etc.

Sardar Hukam Singh: Is the import policy in respect of these parts revised every six months or is it uniform for a number of years?

Shri Karmarkar: As my hon. friend doubtless knows, revision is made every six months, but during the last few periods of six months the policy has been fairly steady.

Sardar Hukam Singh: What was the total value and number of the licences issued?

Shri Karmarkar: During 1951, 988 licences were issued and their value was Rs. 25·74 crores.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi: May I know whether the articles imported under these licences are not produced in our own country?

Shri Karmarkar: That is so, Sir.

Shri Nambiar: May I know if there is any proposal to import capital plants which will produce the electrical goods required by us in India?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice.

LICENSES FOR SALT FACTORIES

***741. Sardar Hukam Singh:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any licenses for setting up new factories for the manufacture of salt were granted during the year 1951-52;

(b) if so, how many and for what places; and

(c) what was the quantity of salt produced by unlicensed small manufacturers during the year 1951-52?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Yes.

(b) 53 licences were issued for the setting up of new salt works. A statement showing the places to which the new licences relate is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 19.]

(c) 25 lakh maunds approximately.

Sardar Hukam Singh: What checks are there to enforce the quality of the salt that is produced in these unlicensed factories?

Shri K. C. Reddy: With regard to unlicensed factories, I cannot say offhand what is the exact machinery that exists. So far as licensed factories are concerned, the Salt Department takes good care to see that everything is done properly. I think there is a general sort of supervision in so far as unlicensed salt works are concerned, but as I said, I am not in a position to say now what exactly are the ways in detail by which the control is effected.

Sardar Hukam Singh: May I know if there is any compulsion on the factories producing salt to send in samples to the laboratories that are maintained for testing salt produced in India?

Shri K. C. Reddy: That is a detail in regard to which I should like to have notice to answer.

Shri Nana Dass: May I know whether it is a fact that an individual salt producer manufacturing salt in an area less than 10 acres need not pay any salt duty at all, whereas an individual salt producer manufacturing salt in an area of the same size, if it be a co-operative organisation, has got to pay salt duty at the rate of four annas per bag; if so, what are the reasons for this disparity?

Shri K. C. Reddy: The reasons are obvious. The granting of permission to small salt manufacturers to produce salt without any licence, as the hon. Member may be aware, has its origin in the Gandhi-Irwin Pact of 1931. Since then the concessions have been liberalised and within an area of ten acres unlicensed salt manufacturers can go on producing salt. They need not pay any licence fee. But so far as others are concerned, they have to pay a nominal licence fee. This applies to co-operative societies, for example, to which the hon. Member referred.

NIGHT SHIFTS IN TEXTILE MILLS

***742. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of textile mills in the country that gave notice to close night shifts during the period from March to April, 1952;

(b) the total number of workers that were thrown out of work due to the closing of night shifts; and

(c) how many of these mills were able to open night shifts again?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (c). 44 cotton textile mills threatened to close down their night shifts during the period March and April 1952. Out of this three mills closed and continue to remain closed so far affecting 575 workers. Two other mills closed down for a short period of about 25 days only and then resumed working. 585 workers were affected during this period. Other mills have either withdrawn or postponed closure notices.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether before giving notice of closure the mills are required to acquaint the Textile Commissioner with the situation with which they are faced?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: This is merely a question of closing down of one of the shifts. Subject to correction, I believe that the Textile Commissioner is kept informed of the intention of the closure. That is how we know about it.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the mills, before closing down the shifts, are required to take the approval of the Textile Commissioner?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not so far as I am aware.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether the reason for the closing down of the shifts or for the giving of notice for closing down the shifts was extra production or the failure of the mills to distribute the goods produced in time and properly?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In the case of one mill, I think they anticipated shortage of coal supply. In the case of most of the other mills, roughly about 43 of them, the difficulty they faced was because of the slump. The offtake had slowed down. State nominees refused to lift the goods and the mills feared that further production at the same rate would lead to a lot of investment of capital which it would not be possible for them to clear in the near future. That is the reason why they issued those notices.

Shri T. N. Singh: Was the failure of the State nominees to lift the goods due to the fact that they did not get the goods they wanted, or was it due to the fact they had no purchasing power and there was also no demand?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think my hon. friend is right in assuming that both factors have operated, but today those factors have ceased to operate. The mills have not closed down. Goods are moving and we are merely discussing a thing which might have happened but has not happened luckily.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether any mill in South India, say in Madras, Coimbatore or Madura, has threatened to close down or has already closed down?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to have notice.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: May I know whether Government have taken notice of the fact that the mills have closed down the shifts to create pressure and force the price of cloth to go up?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Not so far as we are aware.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I know whether the Government have any machinery for verifying the reasons given by the mill owners for closing down the shifts?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: We are in close touch with the industry. In fact, it is our duty to see that mills are not closed and production is kept up. The Textile Commissioner has adequate machinery at his disposal to cover the contingency that the hon. Member has in mind.

D. V. C.

***743. Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the recommendation of the Estimates Committee (Fifth Report) regarding the appointment of a Committee to investigate into the work done by the Rehabilitation and Development Department of the Damodar Valley Corporation, has been examined; and

(b) if so, what decision has been taken in this respect?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) The recommendation is under examination of Government.

(b) No decision has yet been taken.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know the progress made in regard to rehabilitation and development. and also whether the same is commensurate with the money expended on it?

Shri Nanda: This same question is under examination. I may inform the hon. Member that the expenditure on rehabilitation and development on 31st March, 1952 was Rs. 18 lakhs and 45 thousand.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know the number of persons who have been uprooted as a result of the operation of this project and how many of these uprooted persons have so far been rehabilitated?

Shri Nanda: I require notice.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: Is it a fact that many of the houses constructed gave way even before they were fit for occupation?

Shri Nanda: The whole question is under examination and as soon as that examination is over, the information will be supplied.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether the report of Mr. Gorwala, who was asked by the Central Government to investigate into all the departments of the D.V.C., has been considered by the Government?

Shri Nanda: There was no specific reference regarding the D.V.C. to Mr. Gorwala.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I know the average cost of the land per acre as reclaimed by this department and the price as compared to the prevailing price in Bihar?

Shri Nanda: The question relates to the operations under the Rehabilitation Department and there were some recommendations and remarks made in the Estimates Committee's report. All that material is under examination.

BOKARO THERMAL STATION

***744. Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the recommendations of the Estimates Committee (Fifth Report) regarding the early completion of the Bokaro Thermal Station and also giving higher priority to flood control and irrigation work have been examined by Government; and

(b) if so, what decisions have been taken on them?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) The recommendation is under examination of Government.

(b) No decision has yet been taken.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether steps are being taken to expedite the work on the Thermal Station?

Shri Nanda: Yes, Sir. The work is progressing very satisfactorily.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether this part of the project is likely to be completed according to the schedule or before the schedule or after the schedule?

Shri Nanda: It is expected to be completed by early next year.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I know when the flood control work will begin?

Shri Nanda: This is not connected with the question of the Thermal Station.

JOURNALISTIC AND CULTURAL DELEGATIONS

***745. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) how many official and non-official journalistic and cultural delegations were sent to different countries in 1951-52;

(b) how the experiences gained by the delegations were utilised;

(c) the total expenditure incurred for delegations; and

(d) how many foreign journalists or parties of journalists visited India in 1951-52, and how their welfare was attended to?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) No delegation of journalists was sent by the Government of India to any country during the year. Five Cultural Delegations, sponsored by the Government of India, were sent in the course of the year. There were some non-official delegations about which no accurate information is available. The latter were not financed by the Government of India.

(b) The object of sending delegations is to promote better understanding between India and the countries visited. In this respect Government consider that the object was served.

(c) A little over Rs. two lakhs.

(d) It is not possible to give a correct figure of all the foreign journalists who have visited India during this period. Many of them did not seek Government's assistance in any way and hence are not included in our records. According to official records, 87 foreign journalists visited India in 1951-52.

Government invited a group of Turkish Journalists and these were treated as official guests during their stay in India.

All foreign journalists who sought Government's assistance were given help in establishing contacts, interviewing prominent people and visiting places of interest. Some were also entertained socially in order to enable them to meet Indian journalists and others.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether an invitation for sending journalistic delegations to India was sent to Iran?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): It has been sent.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether any invitations from other countries have come to us?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot answer that precisely. They might have come, but I am not aware at the moment.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know what steps are being taken by the Government at present in order to establish close cultural relations with other countries?

Mr. Speaker: It is a very wide question.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether other delegations are proposed to be sent abroad?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Government of India in its various Ministries is taking various steps to this end. I cannot suddenly answer that question.

श्री ऐस० ऐन० दास: जब यह सांस्कृतिक मंडल विदेश से लौटते हैं तो क्या वे गवर्नमेंट के पास कोई रिपोर्ट भेजते हैं ?

[**Shri S. N. Das:** Do these cultural missions submit any report to the Government on their return?]

श्री जवाहर लाल नहरू: जी हां, कुछ त कुछ रिपोर्ट तो भेजते ही हैं।

[**Shri Jawaharlal Nehru:** Yes, they do make a report.]

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know whether the attention of the Government is drawn to press reports that the Soviet Cultural Delegation while it was in India, and especially while at Madras, was indulging in political propaganda?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is a very vague question.

Shri C. N. P. Sinha: May I know what steps have the Government taken to associate Members of Parliament with such delegations?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Members of Parliament are included sometimes.

Shri S. C. Samanta: The hon. Minister said that five non-official delegations went abroad. May I know whether they have submitted any report to the Government?

Shri Satish Chandra: Five delegations were official and not non-official.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Is the hon. Member asking about the official or the non-official delegations?

Shri S. C. Samanta: I am referring to the non-official delegations.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They have nothing to do with the Government. They may, if they so choose, send us a report, or they may not.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether in sending these cultural delegations the Government will also take into consideration the workers' feelings and their representations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Next question.

ELECTRIC FANS

***746. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian Standards Institution has formulated the standard of specifications for all types of electric fans manufactured in India;

(b) how much steel was allocated to the electric fan industry in India in the years from 1949 to 1951 (yearwise); and

(c) whether the import of fans from other countries has increased or decreased in recent years and how the prices of imported fans compare with indigenous ones?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) The Indian Standards Institution has finalised and published standard specification for ceiling fans and has prepared a draft specification for table fans. The question of adopting standards for railway carriage fans is at present under consideration.

(b) The following quantities of steel were allotted to the Electric Fan manufacturers on the Central Steel Processing Industries list:—

Year		Quantity.
1949	...	1435 tons.
1950	...	1578 ,,
1951	...	1603 ,,

(c) A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 20.]

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the existing factories in India are manufacturing fans according to the specifications of the Indian Standards Institution and whether any fault has been found with any of the factories?

Shri Karmarkar: Subject to correction, yes.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know about the quality of the indigenous fans in comparison with the imported ones?

Shri Karmarkar: It is quite good.

Shri S. C. Samanta: The hon. Minister has supplied us figures in the statement which go to show that the imported ceiling fan as well as the table fan compare favourably as regards price. May I know why the number of factories existing in India has decreased in 1951?

Shri Karmarkar: I am not sure as to why the number of factories has decreased, if it has decreased, but so far as I am aware, the present annual demand is estimated to be 235,000 tons and so far as ceiling fans are concerned, we have completely cut out the import.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know whether the production has been affected in any way due to the non-supply of the steel required by them?

Shri Karmarkar: I am happy that the hon. Member put that question. In fact production has been progressively increasing. In 1949 the production was 170,843. In 1950 it was 193,799 and in 1951 it was 212,495 Nos.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I know whether the British manufacturers of the G.E.C. are considered to be local manufacturers?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice.

Shri B. R. Bhagat: May I know whether the production of fans is according to the rated capacity of the various firms?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I might mention that production is not according to the rated capacity. The rated capacity is higher. It does not always happen that production is according to rated capacity.

LABOUR TROUBLES IN TEA GARDENS

***747. Shri S. C. Samanta:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) the labour troubles and *fracas* that took place in different tea gardens in Assam and West Bengal in the year 1951-52 and also up to the 30th April, 1952:

(b) the causes of the trouble and *fracas*;

(c) in how many cases the tea estate officers were attacked and manhandled;

(d) whether there was any loss of life;

(e) whether any enquiry either official or non-official was made; and

(f) if so, what are the findings?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) There were 34 cases of stoppage of work in tea gardens in Assam and West Bengal from the 1st April, 1951 to the 30th April, 1952. Four stoppages resulted in acts of violence. In addition, there were nine cases of *fracas* in Assam.

(b) The more important of the causes of the stoppages and *fracas* were:

(1) dis-satisfaction over supply of rations;

(2) demand for increased wages;

(3) protest against alleged ill-treatment by the managerial or supervisory staff; and

(4) dismissal of workers.

(c) In seven cases tea estate officers were attacked.

(d) In one tea estate in Assam, a worker died as the result of the injuries sustained in a *fracas* between two sections of workers over the throwing of coloured water on *fagua* day.

(e) and (f). The officers of the State Government charged with the duty of conciliation intervened and settled the disputes. In cases involving violence, the officers in charge of law and order intervened and took necessary action. In two cases, the courts have convicted the accused.

Shri Venkataraman: Is it a fact that under the Tea Districts Migration Act, labour was assured that they would get rations if they joined service in Assam and West Bengal and is it a fact that rice and rations were not supplied according to that agreement?

Shri V. V. Giri: For the first part of the question, the answer is yes. As regards the second part, I have no information.

Shri Venkataraman: May I know how many of the workmen were injured in the *fracas*?

Shri V. V. Giri: I fear I have not got the information. I shall supply it to the hon. Member.

Shri Thanu Pillai: May I know whether it is fact that many of these troubles are due to the refusal of the right of entry to the friends and relatives of the labourers to see the labourers who serve in the estates?

Shri V. V. Giri: I do not think so.

Shri S. C. Samanta: With reference to part (d) of the question, the hon. Minister said that one life was lost and that it was of a worker. May I know whether his family has been compensated?

Shri V. V. Giri: I have no information. If the hon. Member requires information, I shall give it.

Shri Velayudhan: May I know whether the Minister has received any information regarding the firing that took place in the Pasumalai tea estate in Travancore-Cochin State with regard to rationing...

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: In view of the fact that the Minister said that one of the causes of the dispute was wages, what is the average rate of wages for men, women and children?

Shri V. V. Giri: I should like to have notice.

Shri Nambiar: Arising out of the answer given, may I know whether the Government would seriously consider the institution of an enquiry into the working conditions in tea estates because so much trouble is there?

Shri V. V. Giri: There was an enquiry into the working conditions in tea estates.

Shri Tushar Chatterjea: May I know whether in such enquiries labour representatives are taken in?

Shri V. V. Giri: Representatives are taken in and certainly their views have been given there.

Shri B. S. Murthy: How many workers have been dismissed? May I know whether they have been taken after the Conciliation Board awards?

Shri V. V. Giri: Notice.

WIND MILLS

*748. **Dr. M. M. Das:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the experiments about the Wind Mills carried out by Government in different parts of India, have been completed;

(b) if so, the results;

(c) the average cost of a Wind Mill in India including installation charges; and

(d) the expenditure for the experiments?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) No systematic experiments have been carried out in India on the possibilities of utilising wind power.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) Imported equipment of several types has been offered occasionally which has not been considered very suitable. The price would be about Rs. 5000/- (including cost of installation for a small size equipment.

(d) Does not arise.

Dr. M. M. Das: Am I to understand that no experimental work has been carried out by the Government to find out whether wind mills can be profitably used in this country?

Shri Nanda: Some experiments were carried out in Poona during the past few years. The position is that for the purpose of these experiments a velocity of 10 miles is required. All our observation stations have got only about 8 or less. We have not yet been able to obtain speed recorders of a suitable type. Therefore, systematic investigation has not been set on foot. I may inform hon. Members that very recently the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research who have a committee called the Electrical and Radio Engineering Research Committee have set up a sub-committee for the purpose of collecting relevant data and information and preparing a plan for a wind turbine unit and to submit a report.

Dr. M. M. Das: Am I to understand that experimental work in wind mills will be carried out in the future?

Shri Nanda: I have already answered that question that a sub-committee has been appointed specifically for that purpose.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether any assistance and direction have been sought by the Central Government from foreign wind mill manufacturing companies in this direction?

Shri Nanda: The Government have been watching continuously the progress of experimental activities in other countries. In other countries also, this question is at an experimental stage.

श्री गणपति राम : क्या माननीय मंत्री जी यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या यह बात सत्य है कि उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने विन्ड मिल खोलने का कोई ऐसा प्रयास किया, और यदि हां, तो उस में कितना रूपया खर्च करने का प्रोग्राम है और अब तक कितना खर्च हुआ है ?

[**Shri Ganpati Ram:** Will the hon. Minister be pleased to state whether the U. P. Government have made any attempt to open any wind mill in that State; if so, how much money will have to be spent on it, and how much has been spent?]

Shri Nanda: I shall obtain information if notice is given.

Dr. M. M. Das: May I know whether the Government has carried out any investigation to find out the efficacy and capacity of wind mills that already exist in this country?

Shri Nanda: I should require notice.

CONFERENCE OF CHIEF SECRETARIES

*749. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the main provisions of the decisions arrived at in the recently held Conference of the Chief Secretaries of East Bengal and West Bengal and Assam?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): The main points on which decisions were reached at the Conference held on the 25th/26th April were:

(1) *Boundary disputes relating to Dinajpur, Jalpaiguri, Khulna, 24 Paraganas and Jessore Districts*:

The Directors of Land Records of West Bengal and East Bengal were asked to hold further discussions with a view to settling these disputes.

(2) *Joint survey and demarcation of Goalpara-Rangpur boundary*:

It was decided that armed forces on both sides should be withdrawn; no new border post should be opened and those opened after 11th August 1951 should be closed; and, pending demarcation of boundary, *status quo* should be maintained.

(3) *Interference by East Bengal Land Customs authorities with consignments in transit across Pakistan to India*:

It was decided to make a further study of the legal position and, pending a final decision, to return the detained consignments to India without penal action.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know the area of Indian territory as existed in August 1947 which has passed into the control of Pakistan as a result of the recognition of this *status quo*?

Shri Satish Chandra: I have answered a few questions on this subject a few days ago. Small territories are involved. Sometimes it is a dispute about two or three acres; sometimes a whole village or a river island here and there is under dispute. I cannot give the exact acreage or area.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the police out-posts which were opened after August 1947, which were asked to be withdrawn as a result of this conference have been withdrawn?

Shri Satish Chandra: There was a further discussion after this conference on 17th May between the Directors of Land Records about the implementation of the decision that was arrived at, but there was again some difference of opinion. Action has been stayed till the position is clarified.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether Government has received any information from the Government of West Bengal or Assam that some Pakistani Police infringed upon the Indian boundaries after this Chief Ministers' conference?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): As this question and the answer indicate, there are certain territories which are undefined and there is a continuous argument going on between the two Governments as to whom those islands of rivers or those relatively minor territories belong to and provincial officers meet, but there can be no final decision till there is a final demarcation of boundary.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I know from the hon. Prime Minister the present position about the introduction of passports system between East and West Bengal?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Talks about these are still going on at Karachi. No final decision has been arrived at in all matters, but in some matters connected with that subject, agreements have been arrived at subject to a final overall agreement. One or two matters still remain.

Shri Barman: What is the total length of the boundary between East Bengal and India and how much of it has been already demarcated finally?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The answer was given some time ago, Sir.

Shri Satish Chandra: I think the total length is about 800 miles, subject to correction.

MALAYAN NATIONAL SERVICE REGULATIONS

*750. **Shri P. T. Chacko:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Indians in Malaya will be adversely affected by the proposed National Service regulations; and

(b) if so, the extent to which these regulations will adversely affect them?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) and (b). The Governments of Malaya and Singapore have introduced in the respective legislative bodies, two similar National Service Bills, which empower these Governments to call up, in an emergency, all male persons between the ages of 18 and 55 for national service. Indians are liable, equally with other residents, for such service.

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that those who register under these regulations will not be allowed to leave Malaya?

Shri Satish Chandra: Yes, Sir. There is a provision like that, but people can leave with permission.

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know whether everyone in Malaya, even nationals of India and China, are also affected by these regulations?

Shri Satish Chandra: Yes, Sir. They are affected in the sense that as residents of Malaya, Indians and others are equally liable to this. I have said that in answer to this question.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): This question of nationality is rather confused in areas like Malaya, *i.e.*, we are going through a period when the average Indian has to choose whether he is going to continue to be an Indian national or become a Malayan national. For the moment he is an Indian national and has privileges in Malaya, citizenship privileges like voting etc., but I have no doubt that in the near future he will have to make a choice.

Shri P. T. Chacko: According to press reports, about 700,000 Indians are adversely affected by these regulations. I wish to know whether it is true.

Shri Satish Chandra: Sir, according to our latest information, there is no feeling of panic among the Indian population in Malaya. They are completely prepared to identify themselves with other Malayan citizens.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, whether such restrictions are being imposed upon non-Asiatic residents of Malaya?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Only those persons who are Malayan citizens or claim to be Malayan citizens are affected. Presumably most of them are Asian.

Shri Nambiar: May I know, Sir, whether the cases of Indians who are being hanged are being considered or any protection is being given to them by the Government of India in view of the several reports of hangings coming from Malaya?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that arises.

COMPULSORY SAVINGS SCHEME

***751. Shri P. T. Chacko:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state whether Government have introduced any scheme for compulsory saving by employees in private industrial and commercial concerns?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): The Coal Mines Provident Fund Scheme was brought into force with effect from the 12th May 1947 in the coal mines in West Bengal and Bihar and from the 10th October 1948 in the coal mines in Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. It was extended to the coal mines in Assam and Talcher with effect from the 1st January 1950 and to those in Rewa and Korea from the 1st April 1950. The scheme provides for a compulsory contributory provident fund, the employee contributing at certain prescribed rates which are roughly 6¼ per cent. of basic wages and the employer contributing an equal amount. Parliament has recently enacted the Employees' Provident Funds Act of 1952, to provide for the institution of provident funds in factories and other establishments. A Scheme called the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme has been circulated for comments and it is expected that it will be finalised soon, and brought into force by the 1st August 1952.

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know whether several factories have applied for exemption and if so, the approximate number of the factories which have applied for exemption from the operation of this Act?

Shri V. V. Giri: I would like to have notice, and I shall furnish the information.

Shri Venkataraman: Is it a fact, Sir, that large representations are being made against the scheme under the Employees Provident Fund Act, and is it proposed to consult organised labour opinion before finalising the schemes?

Shri V. V. Giri: Some representations have been made. They are not large. If we have to discuss with the employers, we shall certainly discuss with the employees also.

Shri P. T. Chacko: May I know, Sir, whether Government have circulated a draft scheme for the implementation of the proposals for comments?

Shri V. V. Giri: About what? Is it the coal mines or the Provident Fund?

Shri P. T. Chacko: Provident Fund.

Shri V. V. Giri: It has become an Act, and a scheme has been circulated and we are waiting for comments.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, whether Government is contemplating to contribute 6¼ per cent. towards the contribution made by the employer and the employee under this Act?

Shri V. V. Giri: It is not intended by the Government.

Shri Thanu Pillai: Is the present wage structure sufficiently high to compel the worker to make savings?

Shri V. V. Giri: I think so.

Shri S. C. Deb: May I know, Sir, whether Government is contemplating any such scheme in the tea industry?

Shri V. V. Giri: Yes, it will be examined.

Mr. Speaker: The next three questions of Dr. Deshmukh will be taken up at the end as he is not here. No. 755.

SILK CLOTH

*755. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state what is the average consumption of silk cloth per year in India?

(b) What is the average production of silk cloth in the country?

(c) What is the stock of silk cloth with manufacturers?

(d) Why was the necessity felt for reduction of produce of silk goods?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) About 16 million yards.

(b) About 17 million yards.

(c) The information is not available.

(d) The recent reduction in the production of silk goods is due to the present slump which has affected several commodities.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: May I know Sir, what is the effect of the protective duty that has been imposed recently on the production of silk goods?

Shri Karmarkar: The effect, it is presumed, Sir, should be wholesome.

Shri Dabhi: What is the average annual production of hand-spun and hand-woven silk goods?

Shri Karmarkar: I have no separate figures for hand-spun and hand-woven silk goods.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: May I know, Sir, what is the quantity of silk goods exported in the year 1950-51?

Shri Karmarkar: Goods exported in 1950-51 are of the value of Rs. 8,63,722.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know how many power looms, hand looms and mills have been closed recently on account of the slump in the silk market?

Shri Karmarkar: I should like to have notice.

Shri Nambiar: Is there any proposal to solve this silk crisis for which the production is there, and there is no export, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. A very vague question.

Shri Sivamurthi Swami: May I know, Sir, whether any machines for small scale industries in textiles have been imported?

Shri Karmarkar: So far as silk is concerned, we recently imported some four reeling machines from Japan, and we have found them to be useful.

FOREIGN CAPITAL

*756. **Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state what industries in India have attracted foreign capital since August, 1947?

(b) What is the amount of foreign capital invested in India during this period and by what countries?

(c) What is the proportion of Indian capital invested in the same industries?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A list of the principal industries in which investment of foreign capital was sanctioned during the years 1948—51 is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 21.]

Information in respect of 1947 is not available.

(b) A country-wise statement of foreign capital investments permitted during the years 1948—51 is placed on the Table of the House [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 22.]

(c) The percentage of Indian capital was 40.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: What was the criterion for the sanction of investment of foreign capital in Indian industries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would refer the hon. Member to the Industrial Policy Statement of the Government issued in April 1948 and the statement made by the hon. the Prime Minister in 1949 in regard to foreign capital.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Was there any offer of foreign investment which was refused in recent years and, if so, may I know in respect of what industry and for what reasons?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the hon. Member would give any specific instance where an offer was made and the same was refused, I can answer the question. But a question of this nature I am afraid I cannot answer.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: Was there any refusal to any country? That is my question.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, as I said, the answer is the same. If there is any specific country from which an offer was made and if my hon. friend has the information, I shall certainly attempt to answer that question.

Shri K. K. Basu: May I know which of the foreign countries are investing their capital in Indian industries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like the hon. Member to refer to the statement placed on the Table of the House in reply to part (b) of the question. It gives all the information he wants.

Shri Joachim Alva: Has Government made earnest enquiries when foreign capitalists seek an outlet in India that their Governments give the same facilities to our nationals in those countries, especially Switzerland?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Presumably so.

Pandit Munishwar Datt Upadhyay: What are the conditions attached to the investment of foreign capital in India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As I said, I should like my hon. friend to refer to the statement made by the hon. the Prime Minister in 1949 in regard to investment of foreign capital. That still holds the field.

BEJOY KRISHNA ASHRAM, DACCA

***757. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Bejoy Krishna Ashram (Satish Sarkar Road, Dacca) has been occupied by trespassers;

(b) if so, whether Government have moved the Government of Pakistan to restore it to the Shebait;

(c) whether Government have information about the present condition of the Ashram particularly as to the preservation of its religious sanctity; and

(d) whether the usual religious rites are being performed there to the deity?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) Yes.

(b) Representations were made by the Deputy High Commissioner for India, Dacca, and the Minister for Minority Affairs. As a result the District Magistrate, Dacca, wrote to the Shebait on 21st June 1951 that possession of certain parts of the Ashram would be restored and that trespassers would be ejected from other parts. Correspondence about this is still going on.

(c) and (d). Government's information is that the buildings are in a bad state of repairs and that no religious worship is being performed in the temple. The major portion of the Ashram is still occupied by trespassers. This is regarded as an act of desecration.

Shri A. C. Guha: Are we to understand that the assurance given by the District Magistrate has not yet been implemented?

Shri Satish Chandra: The District Magistrate first issued an order that the entire Ashram should be vacated. The order was not implemented. The matter was taken up again by the Shebait, and the District Magistrate modified the order by saying that the portions which are used for public worship shall only be vacated. The Shebait was not prepared to take back the Ashram on those terms. He thought that it would not be possible for him to use it till the entire Ashram including the compound and the attached buildings is restored. The matter has been taken up at diplomatic and governmental levels. No decision has however been taken by the Pakistan Government, and the efforts of the Government of India have been futile so far.

Shri A. C. Guha: Has my hon. friend any information about some of the places of worship in Dacca and Chittagong on which a question was asked in a previous session? Can he say what has happened to those places.

Shri Satish Chandra: I would require notice. I can give information only about Shri Bejoy Krishna Ashram.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the representations in respect of the Bejoy Krishna Ashram were made to the Government of Pakistan before or after the Chief Ministers' Conference, and whether this matter was also brought up before that Conference?

Shri Satish Chandra: This matter has been pending since February 1950 when the disturbances took place in Bengal. It was informally discussed at the Chief Secretaries' Conference on the 25th and 26th April last, but no decision was arrived at. The discussion has not been recorded in the proceedings of that Conference.

UNATTACHED WOMEN'S TRAINING CENTRE

***758. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that an unattached Women's Co-operative Training Centre was started at Habra (W. Bengal); and

(b) if so,

(i) the number of trainees taken;

(ii) period of training and nature thereof;

(iii) whether any allowance was to be given and if so, upto what period that allowance has been given; and

(iv) what has happened to the trainees after the training?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Yes.

(b) (i) 100.

(ii) 6 months for training in

(1) Fruit Preservation;

(2) Spinning and weaving;

(3) Tailoring; and

(4) Button making.

(iii) Yes, for the entire period of training.

(iv) The information is being obtained and will be laid on the Table in due course.

Shrimati Sushama Sen: May I know if Government have any scheme of providing these women that have been trained with any means of livelihood?

Shri A. P. Jain: Yes, these women are given a sum of Rs. 250 for buying small machinery, etc. Sometimes they are given sewing machines to carry on their trade.

Shri A. C. Guha: If after getting proper information the Government find that these women have not been paid all the allowances, will the Government make prompt payments to them?

Shri A. P. Jain: Certainly, I will draw the attention of the West Bengal Government who I hope will take adequate steps in this direction.

METALLURGICAL COAL

***759. Shri A. C. Guha:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) the average raising of metallurgical coal per month since January, 1950 to March, 1952;

(b) whether since the formation of the Coal Board, there has been any appreciable decrease in the consumption of metallurgical coal; and

(c) the average monthly export of metallurgical coal during the same period (January, 1950 to March, 1952)?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) The figures are under compilation by the Coal Board and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

(b) Yes; the current loco coal supplies effective from 1st January, 1952 provide for replacement of about 110,000 tons of metallurgical coal per month by non-metallurgical coal.

(c) The average monthly exports of coking coal are:—

1950—8,069 tons

1951—36,939 tons

1952—42,088 tons

(average of first 3 months).

Shri A. C. Guha: May I know whether the Government is charging higher prices for metallurgical coal than for ordinary coal?

Shri K. C. Reddy: I want notice to answer that question.

Shri A. C. Guha: In respect of the exports of metallurgical coal to foreign countries, may I know whether the orders from those foreign countries have been specifically for metallurgical coal or for ordinary coal?

Shri K. C. Reddy: I want notice to answer that question, but I can say this. We have decided to export some metallurgical coal to foreign countries with a view to earning foreign exchange. The demand of course is presumably for metallurgical coal.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MACHINE TOOLS

***752. Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the value of machine tools (i) imported into India from foreign countries; and (ii) manufactured in India in each of the years 1950, 1951 and 1952?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 23.]

TEA AND COFFEE (EXPORT)

***753. Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the total export of tea and coffee from India in 1949, 1950 and 1951?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 24.]

SHIP BUILDING

***754. Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state how many ships are proposed to be built in the Hindustan Shipyard in the current year?

(b) Do the Government of India propose to buy any ships from foreign countries, and if so, how many and from what countries?

(c) Do the Government of India propose to open any other ship-building yard?

(d) If so, where and when?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) Three ships whose keels were laid last year will be completed within the course of the next five months and three more ships whose keels are to be laid during this year, will be completed within the next eighteen months or so.

(b) It is not proposed to buy any commercial ships on Government account.

(c) No.

(d) Does not arise.

D. V. PROJECT

***760. Shri T. N. Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state whether it is proposed to hold an Inter-State Conference to consider the economics of the Damodar Valley Project?

(b) If so, what are the special subjects to be discussed at the Conference?

(c) When is the Conference likely to meet?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) to (c). An Inter-State Conference was held on the 31st May 1952 to consider certain matters relating to Damodar Valley Project. The main items in the agenda were: consideration of Maithon, Panchet Hill and Irrigation and Barrage Projects; basis for the high rates for the Konar contract; cost accounts of land reclamation; funds for 1952-53; betterment levy. A few of the items were discussed and it is proposed to hold another conference in the beginning of July 1952 to discuss the remaining items and take final decisions.

KOSI PROJECT

***761. Shri T. N. Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state how much has the Kosi project cost up to date and what is the total area served by it?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): The investigation of the Kosi Project has cost Rs. 74,67,797 upto the year ending 1951-52. The total gross area that will be served by the Project when it is completed will be 32·77 lakh acres.

EUROPEAN PAYMENTS UNION

***762. Shri M. R. Krishna:** (a) Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether our country is participating in the European Payments Union?

(b) What are the benefits so far achieved from this Union?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) India does not participate directly in the European Payments Union, but by virtue of her association with the Sterling Area, she indirectly benefits from the European Payments Union arrangements.

(b) The main benefit to India is that so far as restrictions on payments and trade are concerned, it is now not necessary to discriminate between hard and soft European currencies.

INDO—U. S. TECHNICAL CO-OPERATION AGREEMENT

*763. **Shri Barman:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state how many development projects under the Indo-U.S. Technical Co-operation Agreement have been started in India and in which places?

(b) What is the production increase expected from each project and in which years?

(c) What is the population benefited by the projects?

(d) What is the cost involved in each project?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) I invite attention to Articles 1 and 2 of Operational Agreement No. 8 on Community Development Programme.

(b) No targets have been fixed.

(c) About 10 millions.

(d) Rs. 65 lakhs per project of the basic type and Rs. 111 lakhs per project of the composite type.

MISUSE OF IMPORT LICENSES

*764. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the action taken against the 35 misusers of import licences as discovered by Government (*vide* action taken on promise made in reply to the starred question No. 240 dated the 14th September, 1951); and

(b) whether any Government employees have also been found to be at fault?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Out of 35 cases, in 15 cases the licence holders were found to have violated the Import Trade Control Regulations and suitable action was taken against them. In 8 cases charges could not be established against the licence holders. The remaining 12 cases are still under investigation.

(b) None.

जांक नदी परियोजना

*७६५० **श्री जांगड़े** : क्या **योजना तथा नदी घाटी परियोजना** मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) मध्य प्रदेश की जोंक नदी परियोजना को पुरा करने में कितने एकड़ कृषि यौग्य और उसर जमीन के और कितने गांवों के पानी में डूबने की संभावना है ;

(ख) कथित परियोजना के पूरा होने के बाद कितने लोगों को उस स्थल से हटाना होगा ; और

(ग) क्या यह परियोजना वहु-उदेश्यी परियोजना होगी या केवल सिंचाई की परियोजना ?

JONK RIVER PROJECT

[*765. **Shri Jangde:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) how many acres of cultivable and waste land and how many villages are likely to be submerged in the course of the completion of the Jonk River Project in Madhya Pradesh;

(b) the number of people who will have to be removed from that site after the completion of the said project; and

(c) whether this Project is going to be a multi-purpose Project or only an irrigation Project?]

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). This project is still under investigation and no project report has yet been prepared. The figures for submerged area and population to be displaced are, therefore, not available.

(c) The project is being investigated as a multi-purpose scheme, the main features being irrigation and generation of hydro-electric power.

शिक्षित बेरोजगार

*७६६० **श्री जांगड़े** : (क) क्या **श्रम** मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या सरकार ने विविध सेवा योजनालयों से यह सूचना मांगी है कि उन मैट्रिक और ग्रेजुएटों की संख्या क्या है, जिन्होंने सेवायोजनालयों

में अपने आप को पंजीबद्ध कराया था, पर जिनको अब तक कोई काम नहीं मिला ?

(ख) क्या जनता के इस वर्ग में बेकारी बढ़ रही है, या घट रही है ?

EDUCATED UNEMPLOYED

[***766. Shri Jangde:** (a) Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state whether Government have sought any information from the various Employment Exchanges as to the number of matriculates and Graduates who have registered themselves at the Employment Exchanges but have not obtained any employment so far?

(b) Is Unemployment among this Class of people on the increase or decrease?]

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) Yes.

(b) Unemployment in regard to this category of applicants has shown a tendency to increase during recent months.

खान मजदूरों को सुविधायें

***७६७. श्री जांगड़े :** क्या श्रम मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत सरकार द्वारा स्वयं या खान मालिकों को विधि द्वारा विवश करके किन स्थानों पर और किस रूप में खान मजदूरों कों आमोद-प्रमोद, मनोरंजन, शिक्षा, चिकित्सा, पानी, उद्यान, खेल, बच्चों के लिए दूध, स्नानागार, निवासगृह, प्रसूति-चिकित्सा आदि की सुविधायें दी या दिलायी गयी हैं?

AMENITIES TO MINE WORKERS

[***767. Shri Jangde:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state at what places and in what manner the Central Government have themselves provided or compelled the mine owners by law to provide the miners with amenities such as means of amusement and entertainment, education, medicine, water, parks, games, and supply of milk to children, baths, housing, maternity care etc.?]

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): A statement giving the particulars is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 25.]

WAGES AND RATION OF LABOURERS IN TEA INDUSTRY

***768. Shri K. P. Tripathi:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state whether the Ministry of Commerce and Industry has given any assurance to the Tea Industry involving labour wages and rations issued to labourers at concession rates?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): No such assurance was given.

The attention of the hon. Member is also invited in this connection to the reply given by the Minister of Commerce and Industry to part (e) of Starred Question No. 226 on the 27th May, 1952.

IMPORT OF MOTOR CARS

*769. { **Shri Jhunjhunwala:**
Pandit M. B. Bhargava:

Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India allow the import of cars only in CKD condition;

(b) whether a special provision is made to meet the special requirements of State Governments;

(c) if so, how many complete cars and trucks have been imported to meet these special requirements during the years 1949, 1950 and 1951·

(d) how many cars have been imported as personal baggage during the years 1949, 1950 and 1951:

(e) the total imports of parts for cars and trucks during the years 1949, 1950 and 1951;

(f) the total demand for cars and trucks in India separately?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes, Sir. unless cars are imported as personal baggage or by Foreign Diplomats stationed in India.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Actual import statistics are not available. The total values of licences granted to State Governments were as follows:—

		(in lakhs of Rs.)
1949	...	50·19
1950	...	47·20
1951	...	81·24

(d) During the period September 1951—March 1952. 1543 such cars were imported as personal baggage.

(e) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(f) It is estimated to be 12,000 cars and 12,000 trucks a year excluding the special requirements of Defence and State Transport Services.

STATEMENT

(In Lakhs of Rs.)

	Cars		Trucks	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
1949 ..	8,463	375	15,342	765
1950 ..	8,061	304	4,914	332
1951 ..	9,677	442	3,743	229

Note—(i) The above figures exclude components minus the engines imported by Messrs. Hindustan Motors Ltd., Calcutta.

(ii) The figures include import of cars in built-up condition imported as personal baggage or by foreign diplomats stationed in India.

CEMENT (PRICE)

*770. **Shri Jhunjhunwala:**
Pandit M. B. Bhargava:

Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether three new cement factories, one in Saurashtra and two in South India, are being allowed a specially higher price with effect from the 1st July, 1949;

(b) if so, the prices that are allowed to these factories and the difference between the prices allowed to these factories and the older units; and

(c) how long these factories will be allowed to charge the higher price?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Not now. The higher price concession allowed to the three cement factories from 1st July 1949 has been withdrawn from 1st April 1952.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH PAKISTAN

*771. **Shri Jhunjhunwala:**
Pandit M. B. Bhargava:

Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether Government intend to renew the trade Agreement with Pakistan which is due to expire on the 30th June 1952?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): The matter is under consideration.

OVERPAYMENT IN CONTRACT IN DAMODAR VALLEY PROJECT

*772. **Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any loss has been incurred in the Damodar Valley project by over-paying on any single contract;

(b) if so, how much was the loss;

(c) who was responsible for the loss; and

(d) what action was taken in this regard?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (d). Do not arise.

NATIONAL BUILDING ORGANISATION

*773. **Shri A. M. Thomas:** (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state whether any proposal is under consideration to establish a National Building Organisation to collect, collate and dissiminate technical information?

(b) Has the Committee of experts appointed for building works recommended such a course?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) The proposal to establish a National Building Organisation is under consideration. Inter-departmental consultations are in progress and will be completed shortly. The proposal has the support of the Planning Commission, who have said in their draft Five Year Plan that a National Building Organisation should be set up on the lines of the Central Roads Organisation with a view to pooling the experiences of principal engineering officers connected with buildings in the various States.

(b) Yes.

पश्चिमी पंजाब के विस्थापित व्यक्तियों का ऋण

*७७४. **डा० सत्यवादी :** क्या पुनर्वास मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) पश्चिमी पंजाब से आये विस्थापित व्यक्तियों को दिये गये ऋण की कुल राशि ;

(ख) ऋण पाने वाले हरिजन विस्थापित व्यक्तियों की संख्या और ऋण की कुल राशि ;

(ग) एक हरिजन को ऋण के रूप में दी गयी अधिकतम राशि ?

LOANS TO DISPLACED PERSONS OF WEST PUNJAB

[***774. Dr. Satyawadi:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of loans granted to displaced persons from the West Punjab;

(b) the number of displaced Harijans granted loans and the total amount of loans; and

(c) the maximum amount granted as loan to a Harijan?]

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (c). Displaced persons from West Punjab and displaced Harijans are scattered all over the country; and no separate records are maintained for them. The labour involved in the collection of the required information will be incommensurate with the results to be achieved.

I may however inform the hon. Members that no distinction is made between a Harijan and displaced person in the grant of loans.

SERICULTURE

***775. Shri Sarmah:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether Government have examined the method of cottage industry adopted in (i) Japan and (ii) Italy in respect of sericulture and production of silk yarn?

(b) If so, do Government propose to lay on the Table of the House the details of the methods or plans adopted in these two countries.

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). A body of experts were recently sent by the Central Silk Board to study the methods of cottage industry in respect of sericulture in Japan. The remarks of the Silk Board on the recommendations of the experts as to the methods and plans adopted in Japan are awaited.

No such study has been made in the case of Italy.

COTTAGE INDUSTRIES IN JAPAN

***776. Shri Sarmah:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether a critical study has been made of the (i) ways; (ii) means; and (iii) methods adopted by Japan in respect of her small and cottage industries?

(b) If so, do Government propose to lay on the Table of the House the result or conclusion of such study?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Yes, Sir. The reports of the delegations sent in recent years to Japan to study her cottage industries have been considered by Government.

(b) These results of and conclusions drawn from a study of these reports have not yet been finalised.

SOUTH AFRICAN SATYAGRAHA

***777. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state how many Indians have been arrested in South African Satyagraha so far?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): To the best of Government's knowledge Dr. Dadoo is the only person of Indian descent who has so far been arrested.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

***778. Shri N. P. Damodaran:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) the mode of recruitment of the personnel for the implementation of the Community Development Projects at the Centre;

(b) what are the considerations by which the suitability of candidates for posts at different levels will be judged: and

(c) whether there has been any direction from the Centre to the Madras State in respect of taking or lending the services of the Firka Development personnel in the Community Development Projects of the State?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) The Community Projects Administration is a wing of the Planning Commission which has been designated as the Central Committee under the Indo-American Technical Co-operation Agreement, and recruitment of its staff is made according to the normal procedure laid down by Government.

(b) The considerations will vary according to the nature of the post. In the case of selection of Project Executive Officers the Operational Agreement on Community Development Programme has indicated that special regard will be paid to experience, general outlook, understanding of the needs and methods of community development, and capacity for leadership as well as ability to secure both official and non-official co-operation.

(c) No.

COMPENSATION TO PEOPLE AFFECTED BY HIRAKUD DAM PROJECT

***779. Shri B. N. Misra:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) the average rate at which compensation is being paid to the people affected by the Hirakud Dam Project for the different classes of lands acquired; and

(b) the basis of the offer?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). The information is being collected from the Government of Orissa and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as it is received.

PRICE OF COCOON

***780. Shri Madiah Gowda:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the variations in the price per pound of cocoon in various silk production centres, for each quarter during the last two years; and

(b) the main reasons for the variation?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 26.]

(b) The exigencies of demand and supply.

EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGES

***781. Ch. Raghubir Singh:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state what is the average expenditure on each Employment Exchange in different States?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): Rs. 3,100 per month (Approx.).

OIL AND OILSEEDS

***782. Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) which are the countries that are main consumers of oil and oil-seeds from India;

(b) what are the quantities of oil and oil-seeds purchased by these countries respectively in 1950-51 and 1951-52; and

(c) whether the heavy export duties imposed on these commodities last year have resulted in the loss of overseas markets in respect of these commodities?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). A statement is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 27.]

(c) No, Sir.

PAINT FACTORY AND CEMENT FACTORY IN RAYALASEEMA

***783. Shri Viswanatha Reddy:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Rayalaseema Development Board has recommended the setting up of a Paint Factory and a Cement Factory in Rayalaseema; and

(b) whether it is a fact that the main raw materials necessary for the working of these factories are available in the region?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The main raw material for cement manufacture, namely, limestone, is reported to be available in that region, but most of the raw materials required by the paint industry are not available there.

PRICE OF *Kapas*

***784. Shri K. G. Deshmukh:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) what is total number of *kapas* bales purchased by the Government licensees in Madhya Pradesh during the year 1951-52 and up to the 15th May, 1952; and

(b) what was the average rate, per *khandi*, offered to the sellers of *kapas* by the licensees during the period from the 1st January, 1952 to 15th May 1952?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). There is no control on price and distribution of *kapas* and therefore no statistics are kept regarding the purchase of *kapas* made by the licensees or price offered to sellers by buyers.

HIRAKUD DAM PROJECT

***785. Dr. Natabar Pandey:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of money spent so far in the different reclamation centres for rehabilitating the people affected by the Hirakud Dam Project; and

(b) out of the amount referred to in part (a), what amount has been spent on (i) establishment charges, (ii) purchase of tractors and bulldozers and (iii) other items of expenditure?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). The information is being collected from the Government of Orissa and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as it is received.

SHORTAGE IN CLOTH PRODUCTION

***786. Shri Morarka:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the total loss of production of cloth due to power shortage in Bombay in 1951 and 1952?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): About 105 million yards.

EXCHANGES

VACANCY NOTIFIED TO EMPLOYMENT

***787. Shri P. N. Rajabhoj:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state:

(a) how many vacancies were notified to the Employment Exchanges by the different departments of the Government of India for recruitment to Class III and Class IV cadres; and

(b) how many of these were notified as reserved for the Scheduled Castes?

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): (a) Separate figures are not maintained exclusively for Class III and Class IV cadres.

(b) Does not arise.

श्रमिक बस्तियां

***७८८. श्री बी० आर० वर्मा :** क्या **श्रम** मत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगें कि सरकार के पास श्रमिक बस्तियां बनाने की कोई योजना है, और यदि है, तो उस में क्या प्रगति हुई है ?

LABOUR COLONIES

[***788. Shri B. R. Verma:** Will the Minister of **Labour** be pleased to state what scheme Government have for the construction of labour colonies, and if so, the progress made therein?]

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): The Government of India have two schemes for housing labour—one for industrial workers and the other for coal-miners. Under the Industrial Housing Scheme 1712 houses have been constructed in Bombay so far and 400 houses are under construction in Madhya Pradesh, 108 in Bihar, and 261 houses in Orissa. Under the scheme for housing coal-miners, 1566 houses have been constructed at Bhuli in Jharia Coalfields; 48 houses at Bijoynagar in Raniganj Coalfields; and 539 houses in the railway collieries, by the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund.

A further project of 481 houses has been sanctioned under the subsidy scheme under which 54 houses have been constructed and 49 are under construction. Under this scheme, the Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund pays a subsidy to the coal-miners equal to 20 per cent. of the cost of construction or Rs. 600 per house, whichever is less, if the houses are built in accordance with the plans and specifications prescribed by the Fund.

DEVELOPMENT WORKS IN MADRAS STATE

***789. Shri Veeraswamy:** Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) what are the various development works to be undertaken in Madras State under the Five Year Plan; and

(b) the names of the places where such works will be executed?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). A statement giving particulars of the irrigation and power projects in the Madras State and the districts to which they relate is placed on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 28.]

REFUSAL OF PASSPORT TO DR. K. M. ASHRAF

***791. Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Dr. K. M. Ashraf, an Indian national, was refused a passport for which he had applied to our Consular Office in London in February, 1948 and on subsequent dates;

(b) whether it is a fact that the said Dr. K. M. Ashraf was declared an evacuee late in 1951, and when in January this year he requested our High Commissioner to visa a travel document issued to him by the British Home Office, the request was turned down; and

(c) if the answers are in the affirmative, the reasons for such action?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) Government of India consider that Dr. Ashraf does not qualify for Indian citizenship. Hence the question of a grant of an Indian passport to him does not arise.

(b) Yes.

(c) The reason is that he is not considered an Indian national.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTO TEA INDUSTRY

*792. **Shri Venkataraman:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have appointed a Committee to investigate into the Tea Industry;

(b) the members of the Committee; and

(c) the terms of reference of the Committee?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) Government have appointed a team of two officials assisted by a Cost Accounts Officer for this purpose.

(b) The members of the team are:

(1) Shri E. Rajaram Rao, Member, Central Board of Revenue, Ministry of Finance, Government of India.

(2) Shri M. A. Mulky, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Government of India.

(c) To investigate into the difficulties being experienced by the tea industry owing to the sharp fall in price and to recommend measures of relief.

DISPLACED PERSONS' COLONIES

*793. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) the total number of Central Government displaced persons' colonies in West Bengal and the number of displaced persons housed therein;

(b) how many have closed down during the last three years (year-wise); and

(c) the number of women and children who have died therein during the last three years (year-wise)?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) and (b). The Fulia Township is the only colony of displaced persons in West Bengal run by the Central Government, its population was 2,478 on the 31st March 1952.

(c) The information is being obtained and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR DISPLACED WOMEN

*794. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) how many institutions there are under the *aegis* of Central Government for giving vocational training to displaced women?

(b) where are these centres; and

(c) how many women have been given employment through the efforts of Government?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) Two such institutions are run directly by the Government of India.

(b) Rajpura and Faridabad.

(c) The information is not available.

IRON ORE

*795. **Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether iron ore is being exported abroad;

(b) if so, to which countries;

(c) from which districts of the various States of India iron ore is taken for export;

(d) whether any country has been offered to increase its import of iron ore from India; and

(e) what are the export figures of this commodity for 1950 and 1951?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Japan, Germany and Netherlands.

(c) Singhbhum in Bihar, Keonjhar and Mayurbhanj in Orissa, Ratnagiri in Bombay and Cuddapah and Bellary in Madras.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) 55,322 tons in 1950 and 1,85,487 tons in 1951.

COMPENSATION FROM JAPANESE GOVERNMENT

*796. **Bishop Richardson:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state what steps are being taken for the recovery of compensation from the Government of Japan for property destroyed during the occupation of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands by the Japanese in the last War?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): It is not proposed to take any further steps for recovery of compensation from the Government of Japan.

C.P.W.D. EMPLOYEES

***797. Shri Nambiar:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the employees of the Central Public Works Department are treated as employees coming under the operation of the Central Pay Commission's recommendations;

(b) if so, whether the work-charged staff have the same benefits;

(c) whether it is a fact that 80 per cent. of the work-charged staff are still considered as temporary or casual and if so why; and

(d) whether Government have received any representation from the Central P.W.D. Workers' Union, New Delhi, to redress the urgent demands of the workers and if so, what action has been taken?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir. The benefits that have been extended to the other Government servants by the acceptance of the recommendations of the Pay Commission have also been extended to the work-charged staff, except that the revised pension rules have not yet been made applicable to them. The question of extending these revised rules to them is under active consideration.

(c) A large number of work-charged staff are temporary. The very nature of their work makes it necessary that a comparatively large proportion should be employed on a temporary basis.

(d) I do not know which particular representation the hon. Member has in mind, but I may say that representations are received from the Union from time to time and they are all considered with sympathy.

BALANCE OF TRADE

145. Shri B. R. Bhagat: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the balance of trade of India with the Dollar Area in the years 1950 and 1951;

(b) the volume of export and import during the period with the Dollar Area; and

(c) the chief items and volume of export and import during the period with the Dollar Area?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b)—

	(Figures in Lakhs of Rs.)	
	1950	1951
Imports	112,13	224,90
Exports	127,09	174,56
Balance of Trade	+14,96	—50,34

(Figures for 1951 are provisional)

(c) Two statements are laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 29.]

INDIAN EMPLOYEES OF SHANGHAI MUNICIPAL COUNCIL

146. Sardar Hukam Singh: (a) Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether any representations have been received by Government from the Indian Employees of the former Shanghai Municipal Council for recovery of their dues from the People's Republic of China?

(b) What action has been taken on the representations, if any, which were received?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Shri Satish Chandra): (a) Yes.

(b) The Government of India have been pursuing the question of the recovery of their dues with the former Government of China as well as with the present Government, but without any success so far.

WOOLLEN AND SILK MILLS, AMBERNATH

147. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: (a) Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that two woollen and silk mills and a leather factory in Ambernath which are managed by the Deputy Custodian of Evacuee Property, Thana, have been closed down?

(b) If so, how many workers have been thrown out of employment?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) The Ambernath Mills have been temporarily closed since the 11th May, 1952, pending finalisation of negotiations for their lease to a syndicate of displaced persons. The terms of the lease have been settled and the mills will reopen shortly as soon as necessary formalities have been completed.

(b) 998.

CUT IN CIVIL AVIATION FUEL

148. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state whether Government propose to impose a cut in the fuel consumption for civil aviation?

(b) If so, what is the percentage of the cut which is going to be effected?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). A cut was imposed for 28 days only, with effect from 15th May 1952. Originally, the cut was 35 per cent. based on the offtake of aviation spirit for the full month of April 1952, but subsequently the cut was reduced to 22 per cent. for the whole 28 day period. All restrictions are being removed and normal consumption restored from the 12th instant.

MINOR AND MAJOR PROJECTS

149. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state what are the comparative figures (State-wise) for money spent on minor irrigation projects in comparison with that advanced for multi-purpose major projects during the years 1949-50, 1950-51 and 1951-52?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): The information is being collected from the State Governments concerned and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

PASSPORTS

150. Shri Raghavaiah: (a) Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the number of applications received for passports to U.K. and U.S.A. during the years 1948 to 1951?

(b) What was the number of applications received for passports to U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China and East European Countries during that period?

(c) Were all the applicants granted passports?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) to (c). It is not possible to furnish the information asked for by the hon. Member as no record is kept of passports granted country-wise.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

151. Shri V. P. Nayar: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the total value of imports from

(i) United States of America;

(ii) United Kingdom; and

(iii) Russia

during the years 1949, 1950, 1951 and 1952; and

(b) the total value of exports from India to

(i) U.S.A.;

(ii) United Kingdom; and

(iii) Russia

for the above period?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 30.]

POLITICAL PENSION TO FOREIGN REFUGEES

153. Shri Jhulan Sinha: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the amount of political pension being paid at present to foreign refugees and descendants of persons who rendered service abroad with the names of recipients and the nature of service rendered?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): There are no foreign refugees or descendants of persons, who rendered service abroad, in receipt of political pensions from the present Government. There are, however, at present 23 Afghan refugees in India who are in receipt of maintenance allowances from Government. Their names and the monthly maintenance allowance drawn by each of them are shown in the list attached. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 31.]

None of these refugees has rendered any service to the Government of India. The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the reply given to Starred Question No. 200 by Lala Raj Kanwar on 1st December, 1949.

FOREIGN PUBLICITY

154. Shri Jhulan Sinha: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state the agency employed and the amount being spent annually for foreign publicity during the last five years?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): India's foreign publicity is conducted by our missions abroad, assisted in some instances by Information Officers.

The amount spent annually during the last five years is as follows:—

1947-48, Rs. 8,68,300

1948-49, Rs. 25,35,210

1949-50, Rs. 33,51,200

1950-51, Rs. 30,25,842

1951-52, Rs. 37,58,100.

FARIDABAD AND NILOKHERI TOWNSHIPS

155. Prof. Agarwal: (a) Will the Minister of **Rehabilitation** be pleased to state the total investment made by the Government of India in the Nilokheri development project?

(b) Have the small-scale industries at Nilokheri been affected by the recent slump, if so, to what extent?

(c) Is there any unemployment in the Nilokheri and Faridabad townships, at present, and if so, to what extent?

(d) Which other small-scale industries are proposed to be introduced in the Faridabad and Nilokheri townships?

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri A. P. Jain): (a) to (d). The necessary information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House in due course.

ALUMINIUM

156. Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state what has been the production of Aluminium in India year by year from 1947 to 1952?

(b) What have been the costs of production and the selling prices per ton year by year?

(c) What have been the foreign prices per ton year by year?

(d) What has been the total consumption of Aluminium in India year by year during these years?

(e) What is the cause of the great difference between foreign prices and costs of production?

(f) What steps are being taken by Government to improve the efficiency of the factories producing Aluminium?

The Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri Karmarkar): (a) to (d). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix IV, annexure No. 32.]

(e) There are several causes, the most important being (i) non-availability of power at cheap rates, (ii) production capacity of the plants being not as high as it should be for their economic running, (iii) comparably high costs of raw material used in the manufacture of aluminium and (iv) Indian bauxite being more expensive to mine.

(f) In order to reduce the cost of production, expanded capacity has been sanctioned for both the existing producers.

HIRAKUD RECLAMATION CENTRES

157. Dr. Natabar Pandey: Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) the total acreage of land reclaimed so far in the Hirakud Reclamation Centres for rehabilitating the people affected so far by the Hirakud Reclamation Centres; and

(b) out of the land reclaimed referred to in part (a), how many acres have been made ready for cultivation?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). The information is being collected from the Government of Orissa and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as it is received.

HIRAKUD RECLAMATION CENTRES

158. Dr. Natabar Pandey: Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) how many acres of land in the different Hirakud Reclamation Centres have been cultivated departmentally and how many acres through annual leases; and

(b) the yield of crops in different areas referred to in part (a) above?

The Minister of Planning and River Valley Schemes (Shri Nanda): (a) and (b). The information is being collected from the Government of Orissa and will be placed on the Table of the House as soon as it is received.

HIRAKUD DAM

159. Dr. Natabar Pandey: Will the Minister of **Planning and River Valley Schemes** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of houses, schools, temples and wells for drinking water par.S.2.16.II.1.52

982

Thursday

12th June, 1952

to
3rd July 1952

सत्यमेव जयते

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers

CONTENTS

ath of Shri Sheodass Daga [Col. 1603]

neral Budget—Demands for Grants.—*contd.* [Col 1603—1605, 1606—1680]—

Demand No. 22—Tribal Areas [Cols. 1603—1605, 1606—1678]

Demand No. 23—External Affairs [Cols. 1603—1605, 1606—1678]

Demand No. 24—Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs [Cols. 1603—1605, 1606—1680]

pers Laid on the Table—

(1) Draft Secret Protocol ; (2) 'Current Digest' of Soviet Press; (3) Soviet Map [Cols. 1605—1606]

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Gazettes & Debates Section
Par[illegible]ary Building
[illegible] No. FB-025
Block 'G'
Acc. No. 25022
Dated 20.11.2014

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES
(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 12th June, 1952.

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(*See Part I*)

9-15 A.M.

DEATH OF SHRI SHEODASS DAGA

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed further, I have to inform the House of the sad demise of Shri Sheodass Daga a sitting Member of this House, who died in Raipur. He was a Member of the old Central Legislative Assembly from 1935 till its dissolution in 1947. He was elected to the House of the People from Mahasamund constituency in Madhya Pradesh.

The House will join with me in conveying our condolence to his family. The House may stand in silence for a minute and express its sorrow.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FOR GRANTS—*contd.*

DEMAND No. 22.—TRIBAL AREAS.

DEMAND No. 23.—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

DEMAND No. 24.—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—*concld.*

Mr. Speaker: We shall now proceed with the further discussion on the Demands on External Affairs. We shall proceed with Demand No. 23. I have got an agreed list of cut motions, and I believe one more was requested to be added.

Hon. Members will remember the time limit for speeches, and we shall finish this Demand to-day. What time will the hon. Prime Minister require for his reply?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): I should like to have about an hour, if it is possible.

Mr. Speaker: That means I shall call upon him to reply at 12 NOON. So, the time available for discussion will be up to 12 NOON. The cut motions to be moved are 269, 292, 325, 420, 533, 667, 592.

Activities of diplomatic establishments abroad

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: (Visakhapatnam): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Pursuit of real peace policy

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: (Calcutta North-East): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Relations with Anglo-American powers

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri (Berhampore): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Withdrawal from Commonwealth

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Foreign possessions in India

Shri K. Subrahmanyam (Vizianagaram): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Foreign Policy

Shri R. N. S. Deo (Kalahandi-Bolangir): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Policy towards Pakistan

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): I beg to move:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

Mr. Speaker: The cut motions moved are placed before the House.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated Anglo-Indian): I do not want to strike a discordant note, but when people talk about opposition parties, I want to make it very clear that so far as the Independent Parliamentary Group, the second largest group, is concerned, it has arrived at no agreement with the other parties, either with regard to the speakers or with regard to the cut motions. I think that position ought to be made clear. I have separately submitted the names of the two speakers from our group, in connection with the cut motion:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100 (to discuss foreign policy)."

Mr. Speaker: I should be glad if there is an agreement, among those who are not with the Government. I will not say opposition parties, because they are occasionally with Government and occasionally against them. So it becomes very difficult to meet their demands and satisfy the followers of this group. I have always borne this in mind, and I have tried to select speakers from different representative groups.

Shri Nand Lal Sharma (Sikar): What about independents? They are independent of everything including independence from Parliament!

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

(1) DRAFT SECRET PROTOCOL;
(2) 'CURRENT DIGEST' OF SOVIET PRESS;
(3) SOVIET MAP.

Dr. S. N. Sinha (Saran East): On a point of information, Sir. Yesterday I was asked by Mr. Deputy-Speaker to lay certain papers on the Table of the House. May I have your permission to hand them over to the Secretary?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the hon. Membe may do so. But will he kindly me tion at least the title, and not the co tents, of the papers he is going to l on the Table of the House?

Dr. S. N. Sinha: I beg to lay on th Table the following papers:

1. A typed copy of Draft Secr Protocol.
2. Extracts from the *'Curren Digest'* of the Soviet Pres (11 Pages of typed sheets)
3. A very valuable document, a Soviet map published in 1950 showing Kashmir as British.

[*See* Appendix No. III, annexu No. 9.]

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Can have copies distributed to us?

Mr. Speaker: From now, they wil be placed on the Table of the House and it will be open to the hon. Members to have as many copies as they like.

Shri Nambiar: My point was, can we have the copying done by Government?

Mr. Speaker: It is the business of the hon. Member concerned to take copies of those papers. I do not think I can undertake to distribute various things which hon. Members might be pleased to lay on the Table of the House, by way of statements or other typed extracts.

The reason why I gave the permi sion was that it was under the specifi direction of the Deputy-Speaker that the hon. Member is placing them on the Table of the House, for what they are worth.

When the hon. Member was speakin the other day, his position was cha lenged by the hon. the lady Membe from the Communist Party, and she wanted to have a Parliamentary Commission. This is a different matter At any rate, for the present, the paper have been laid on the Table of the House.

GENERAL BUDGET—DEMANDS FO GRANTS—*contd.*

Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi (Luckno Distt.—Central): For five years, have been amongst those who have ha the responsibility of interpreting India foreign policy abroad. I am therefo deeply thankful for this opportuni for testifying to the success of t policy and of paying a tribute of miration to its architect. Forei policies are a combination of past commitments and present needs. India emerged into independence with a long tradition of friendship with her neighbours and with only one commitment, the commitment to stand by all those who like ourselves were struggling to be free. It was because we realized that freedom cannot live in isolation that we gave support to the wider struggle for freedom in the world, and it was because of this that we identified ourselves with the cases of discrimination and suppression wherever they existed. Events move rapidly these days and memories are short. I would like to remind the House, of that decade, from the late twenties to the beginning of the Second World War when it was the voice of India, then not a free country, that was continuously raised against the suppression of freedom through the growth of Nazism and Fascism in Europe. Hon. Members will remember that throughout that period, when the nations of Europe were silent, and Nazi and Fascist doctrines were growing, when the lights were going out from Europe, one by one, it was the voice of the Indian National Congress that sought to condemn and to plead for action based on justice.

But unhappily condemnation from the West came too late to save the world. During this period we tried in our own small way to get our moral support to the various countries that were the victims of this growth of evil forces in the West. I am sure hon. Members have not forgotten our stand on Ethiopia, on Spain and on Manchuria. I would specially like to refer to Manchuria, Sir, because it was only two weeks ago that I had the privilege of meeting the Head of the Government of North East China, His Excellency Kas Kang, who in power and prestige is very close to Chairman Mao himself. When he met me, one of the first things he said to me was that the people of China had not forgotten India's sympathy in the time of their need. You would remember that the form our sympathy could take was very small. All we were able to do was to send a small medical unit to China. It was a drop in the bucket of China's need. But it had an effect far exceeding the quantitative value and even today, wherever we have gone, that little gesture has been a link in the already strong chain of friendship that exists between our great neighbour and ourselves. That action did not show any fear or fumbling.

With this background it was inevitable that when we emerged into freedom, our first action should be to stretch the hand of friendship to the nations of the world. It was my privilege as leader of the first official Delegation to the General Assembly to enunciate this policy of friendship and to give to the United Nations Charter a pledge of loyalty and support. And I would like to say that during all the difficult days that have followed from 1946 we have never swerved from that allegiance or from the stand we then took that we would consider everything that came before the U.N. on its merits and not be blessed by the opinion of any bloc or group of countries.

Yesterday Mr. Shiva Rao mentioned figures relating to the voting in the United Nations. I would like to carry that a little further since it is tied up with one of the cut motions sought to be moved probably today regarding the foreign policy of India being allied to the Anglo-American bloc. Those hon. Members who remember the events of the last few years in the United Nations will recollect that on all occasions when we stood up to support a particular cause we were not swayed by the anger or the passions evinced by either of the two opposing blocs in the United Nations. I am specially reminded of the issue of South Africa. It is a long time ago since that issue was raised, and, as was pointed out yesterday, what is the result? Trouble still continues in South Africa, discrimination persists and what has India's stand done? But I want to tell you because I am now speaking about India's relationship to the Anglo-American bloc, that our policy has always been an independent one and when we stood up for the ending of discrimination against Indians in South Africa, we were faced with a mighty opposition, the opposition of the United States of America and partial opposition of the Commonwealth, partial in the sense that the Commonwealth refrained from voting on our resolution while the U.S.A. voted against it. But we were not swayed. We held to the right cause and we supported it and as the hon. House will remember, the victory that we achieved at that time has never been repeated in the United Nations up-to-date. It is true that nothing followed. But before I give you the reason why nothing followed that victory, I would like to draw the attention of hon. Members to one or two other facts. Since the South African case was brought by us before the Assembly we have sponsored every cause that came up for justice and equality and for the right, and on all occasions we have had to face some trouble. We have never had the entire

[Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi]

support of all the powerful member-nations. But that has not mattered because we were not seeking a temporary advantage. We were judging the question on its merits and according to the right and in that belief we had the courage to take our stand and to keep our stand. But what happened? Take the question that Mr. Shiva Rao referred to yesterday, of Libya. Take again the question of our stand about the seating of New China in the United Nations. Take the latest stand we have taken—regarding Tunisia. Could any one reasonably with any degree of truth say that in all these stands we were not absolutely independent and unhampered by any blocs or the consideration of their wishes? Going back to the seating of New China, I would like to say to this House that it is very easy to criticise from a distance. But the passion that prevailed at the time when our representatives in the United Nations pleaded for the seating of New China was something which had to be seen, to be understood, and through all that passion and heated emotion the Indian representatives stood firm. because it was the cause of right. because we believed that what had happened in China had come to stay and that China could be a great force for the peace and progress of the world. We were not swayed by the views of any other nations. In the same way. in the case of Tunisia we have taken a stand and I have no doubt that our Government will follow the stand to its logical conclusion.

So. Sir, it is incorrect to talk about our being allied to any particular bloc. Take the case of the recent Japanese Peace Treaty. I was in Washington during that period when the disappointment of India's non-acceptance of the treaty made itself felt through various periodicals and newspapers and made life a little difficult for the Indian representative there. But as soon as that passion was over, as soon as that emotion passed, it was the American people themselves who realised that our stand had been correct. Therefore it is not right that our policies have not been appreciated. It is true that sometimes in the sway of emotion there are things said and done which we resent and we regret, but by and large, there has been a realisation that our stand has been a right one.

Take the question of the Thirty-eighth Parallel. Would any hon. Member say that our intervention was wrong or that our views regarding the Thirty-eighth Parallel were wrong? Think of the suffering that would have been saved, think of the many lives that were lost that would be in the world today if our humble suggestion had been accepted at that time. And today when the clouds of war gather thickly over our heads, I at any rate am deeply conscious of the fact that much could have been averted if India's small voice had been heeded.

Now, I come to the question that was asked yesterday—why is it that our voice is not listened to? I think it is very easy to answer—because we stand for the right, for the uncompromising right and we do not propose to give that up for any expediency. We do not propose to compromise on any vital issue, no matter whether we suffer or not. It is because we have taken our stand on this principle that our strength is gradually increasing and little by little the nations of the world realise that in this time of conflict and suspicion and growing hate, the small voice of India is gaining in ascendancy and that the time may perhaps come when it can help to soothe rather than to aggravate the flame of war and conflict.

I now come to the criticism levelled against us yesterday by my hon. friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram. I have had the pleasure of being associated with him on one of the U.N. Delegations and I had thought that his facts at least would be more correct. But it is unfortunate that the average person even today does not fully appreciate or understand the work of an Embassy or the responsibility of a diplomat. Vague charges are made without understanding the actual work and the actual limitations imposed upon a diplomat abroad. My hon. friend first of all has mentioned—it is a very insignificant point but I would like to correct him—that there have been six incumbents in Washington since we achieved our freedom during the course of five years. I would like to correct him and say that the Agent General for India who was the British Representative in Washington had nothing to do with the present Government. But since India became independent there were three Ambassadors and their terms were not as short as would seem from what my hon. friend said. The first stayed there for one year. The second was there for 7 months and I have just returned from the United States with only two months short of three years service in that Embassy.

The work of an Ambassador is inevitably misrepresented because everything that he has to do cannot be shared with the public. Therefore, it is all the more essential that the general public and particularly the hon. Members of this House should have a clear idea of the type of responsibilities that India has to shoulder in her diplomatic missions. You cannot judge the work of an Ambassador by the number of files that he deals with every day or the number of notes he sends up to his Government. The real work of an Ambassador is the work that goes on from day to day in creating goodwill and understanding in the country of his representation. (*Hear, hear*). That work is to continue whether the policy of his own Government is favourable to the other Government or not. Allow me to say that when one has much to gain by accepting the policy of a more powerful nation, it takes both vision and courage to stick to one's policy, and continue with that work of creating goodwill. I think most of our Ambassadors have attempted to do that.

Then coming to the question of expenditure in an Embassy, that also has given me a good deal of amusement, because the general concept of an Embassy is a fairy palace filled with servants and lights and music and gaiety and innumerable entertainments and the Ambassador lives a life of luxury and ease. But I would like to say, here in defence of those representatives of India who are abroad that to represent India is not an easy task today because the emoluments that go with the position are far less than required for adequately maintaining the prestige of a great nation like India. Even those nations, where national austerity is the rule, recognize this fact and in their foreign representations abroad they spend the money required to maintain the prestige of their country. It is not personal to the Ambassador, Sir. Ambassadors come and go but an Embassy goes on and represents the prestige and policies of the nation. Therefore, it is improper—without having the facts at one's disposal—to make sweeping statements against those who are serving the nation abroad. Unhappily I have not been able to collect all the figures I would have liked to quote to this House. But I would like to point out that so far as Indian representatives are concerned, there have been many many occasions—even in my life in Washington and I was one of what is known as a first class Ambassador in a top post with a high salary and according to our own standards a high allowance and yet there have been instances in my life when I could not meet the expenses in the Washington Embassy and on National Days and the like I have cooked the Indian meals which I have served to 200, 300 or 400 guests because the money was not there to get outside help. (*Hear, hear*). I do not say this for applause but to make it clear that this is not a question to be judged in terms of the rupees—granted in the Budget—we spend abroad. It would be more correct to judge the money in terms of its value abroad, what it brings in terms of the currency of the country of representation. Take the case of our Ambassadors in the smaller countries whose allowances are very limited. One such representative told me only the other day that his allotment for his National Day Party was Rs. 300 and his South Arabian counterpart spent many times that number of pounds sterling. So you will see that merely to make a sweeping charge about expenses in an Embassy is a little unfair because the Embassy has to keep up a certain prestige. It is not a question of eating and drinking. There are innumerable responsibilities that the Ambassadors have to shoulder. Take the case of the United States of America. It is an important Embassy for us. It is very important from the point of view that we have to maintain our closest touch between Senators, between all the leading politicians, between the various business heads and others. I merely mention Washington because it is a place about which I have got my most recent experience. One has to arrange important functions of entertainment. That cannot be done without adequate money.

And then there is the educative process. When one is in a country abroad, one has gradually—through publicity, through one's contact—to educate the public of that country. Now what happens? In the average Embassy we are hampered by lack of funds for our publicity. We get impatient questions put in this House regarding lack of publicity abroad. I like those questions and I would like them to go on because the impatience of this House will perhaps help the Government to outline a better policy towards publicity in our Embassies. I merely mention this to show how handicapped we are. This publicity is however not enough and constantly we are up against the fact that when an issue of importance to India comes up, the general public abroad does not understand its significance. They remain ignorant about it. I had a moment of extreme frustration when a high power lady came up to me one day in America and said: "My dear...What is your work? Do you also look after Pakistan and Afghanistan as well as India?" So in order to try and remedy this tragic state which

[Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi]

is perhaps inevitable, one has to have funds and those funds have to be spent in various ways. I will only take two minutes Mr. Speaker.

There has been much criticism about the way our diplomats have acted. I hold no brief for our Ambassadors. They can look after themselves. But I do hold a brief, Sir, for that splendid band of young men of the foreign service who are holding difficult positions with loyalty and devotion which are worthy of the appreciation of this House. It is not easy to go to distant outposts and live in conditions foreign to what one has been brought up in and for which one has not received sufficient training and I can say that many of these young men have served under me, some of whom I have had the privilege of training. Some of them are occupying good posts today and are giving a good account of themselves. They will be our future Ambassadors. I would like this House to appreciate their record of work and not to judge them too harshly if sometimes they do not fully rise to expectations. There is much that I would like to say on this subject but I have already exceeded my time. I would merely end with a plea that at this time when we are faced on every side by forces that seek to overwhelm us, let us not, let our Government not lose its head, let us not depart from a policy that has been proved right and which has earned the respect of our opponents as well as of those who support our cause.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Sir, on a point of personal explanation. I did not wish to interrupt my hon. friend Mrs. Pandit during her first speech in this House, when she made a reference to what I said yesterday. I will correct her from the record. I said six "tenants"; I did not say "incumbents". I could not have made a mistake of that type.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I think I shall confess to you that a little while ago, anticipating the ire of the hon. Prime Minister, I was trying to fortify myself for this debate with a drink of cold water, and my friend Shri Hiren Chattopadhyaya told me: "This is a very chilly fortification." I was not ready at that time to counter the gracious broadsides which have come from the hon. Member who has just spoken. And if I had known that she was going to get up and deliver her maiden speech in this House, possibly I would have tried to make a better choice. My problem, however, is that in the short time at my disposal I have to refer to so many points which have been made during this debate that I do not know where to begin and where to end. I hope, Sir, you will sympathise with me in my position in view of the concentrated attack which has been directed against our point of view.

Now, dealing with this demand, we find that a certain number of very delectable items have been given—items which show up the character of our administration in a light which I am afraid we cannot commend. There is, for example, the demand for Rs. 3 crores for tribal affairs, and out of that, 75 per cent. goes to the frontier constabulary while less than Rs. 4 lakhs goes to medical establishment, and altogether 10 per cent. goes to all sorts of beneficial activities for the unfortunate inhabitants of these tribal areas. I find also certain other very interesting items, particularly in regard to the embassies to which reference has been made by the hon. Member who has just spoken. We find that about 100 of the principal officers in our embassies and missions abroad get Rs. 15 lakhs. The hon. Member who has just spoken has tried to tell us that they are getting very little indeed; and I noticed—it was a very significant thing—that even Members on the other side of the House could not applaude that particular proposition. We find also that a foreign service inspectorate—heaven knows what it is—spends about Rs. 75,24,000, which is the second largest item in the demand. It seems that only officers at headquarters attend to this work, and occasionally, visits to legations are undertaken ; but we do not understand why so much money should be spent, when we are pursuing the kind of policy which I shall discuss a little later. I find also that in the name of economy the embassy in Czechoslovakia is today in the charge of a junior *charge d'affaires*, while our Government is contemplating the opening of a legation in Franco Spain. I refer to this in particular because the hon. Member who has just spoken has told us that......

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I did not wish to interrupt the hon. Member, but I am surprised to hear of this idea of having a legation in Spain. I have not heard of it before. Perhaps the hon. Member has some secret information from some other source.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: It is in the report of his department—the Ministry of External Affairs. It shows we are going to open a legation in Franco Spain.

An Hon. Member: Consulate.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On page 8 of this report, you say: "It has been decided to open a consulate of India at Barcelona." It is a consulate. After all, if you are going to have trade relations with Franco Spain, it is not quite such a laughable proposition as the hon. Members on the other side may think. It is the year of grace 1952 and we are going to have at least quasi-diplomatic relations with Spain, which is a country against which the hon. Prime Minister has inveighed in the most eloquent terms. I am sure we ought to hang our heads in shame.

The hon. Member who has just spoken has said that our diplomatic policy is compounded of a discussion of our past arrangements and present needs. And she talked about our traditions—our traditions of friendship with different countries, our traditions in regard to the pursuance of a policy of peace. What are we going to do about it? What are our present needs? Our present needs relate primarily to the provision, in our country, of living conditions for our people, to the raising of our people from the sub-human standards to which they have been reduced. And our traditions are traditions of friendship. I submit that our Government is pursuing, not a policy of peace, but a policy of complete involvement, a policy of subservience to certain imperialist elements which are playing the most disastrous and mischievous role in international affairs.

An Hon. Member: Absurd.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: That is the point I wish to emphasise. I do not wish to waste the time of the House by referring to what our Prime Minister said earlier about the necessity of detaching ourselves entirely from the British Commonwealth, about the necessity of our trying to translate our freedom into concrete terms. It is a matter of shame to recall those days—there was a time when Pandit Nehru was a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, when, in defiance of the Congress Leadership he was ready to champion the people's cause from China to Peru, in Spain, in Czechoslovakia, and in Ethiopia, when he was the paladin of the people's hopes. But today we find him yoking himself to the chariot wheels of the imperialist machine of Britain and America, in a manner which makes us feel that the future of the world is being imperilled by our pusillanimity and by our inability to pursue the kind of policy which we are bound to adopt if we remember our past traditions and if we remember out present needs. We know that in the Lucknow Congress Pandit Nehru quoted some poetry. I feel sometimes that he is a minor poet who has missed his vocation. He quoted some poetry and he said that when "the red advance of life" goes on you cannot live between two fires. He is trying to live between two fires. But I want him to remember that he is living in a particular paradise if he considers that he is following a policy of dynamic neutrality. We have no sincerometer, we cannot measure the sincerity of the Prime Minister or of anybody else for that matter by reference to what he says. We judge the sincerity of everybody by concrete, objective results of the policy that is pursued. And I would say that in regard to international affairs the Prime Minister is pursuing a policy which is bringing ruin to our country, which is mortgaging our freedom, and which is making our future absolutely hopeless.

What is it that makes us so disturbed? I asked you a question the other day, and you told me in reply that there was no need for perturbation if we saw the flag, the hated flag, of Britain flying over this building. There was a time when Pandit Nehru would have jumped up impetuously and shouted against it. He did not do so. Members on the other side have said that it is not the British Commonwealth, that it is the Commonwealth of Nations, that it is something of that sort. By God, it is British. If you read the statement which was issued on the occasion of the Queen's Birthday, you will find that it is described as British. And here is a statement by Mr. Eden which says:

> "It is not, I think, an exaggeration nor a mark of self-righteousness to say that the free nations look to the British Commonwealth and the United States together to give them the lead."

This statement was made by Mr. Eden on the 16th August, 1951. And this is a document circulated to Members of Parliament by the British Information Services. We are tied to the apron-strings of Britain and the United States.

Our Navy is spending lakhs of rupees in preparing for manoeuvres, because our Navy is to escort *Queen Elizabeth* of England when she sails for South Africa or heaven knows what other countries.

I refer also to our link-up with British capital. There was a time when Pandit Nehru used to warn us that independence does not mean that in New Delhi or whichever is the capita a brown figure sits in the place of

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

white figure, that independence is to be measured in terms of the objective conditions of life. He has told us that so many times. He has told us that imperialism has many facets, that imperialism tries to exploit a country not only directly but by means of economic invasion, by getting the countries whose raw materials they can use for their own advantage, by securing an area for the investment of their super-profits, and by securing markets for their goods. We continue as a colony of these foreign powers, this Anglo-American combination which is today behaving in such a fashion that the future of humanity is imperilled. World trade suffers today and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance should know that the volume of world trade has fallen if we take into consideration the rise in the population of the world. He ought to know also that in the Moscow International Economic Conference which was attended by very respectable people like Lord Boyd-Orr of Britain, proposals were made and were partially concretised in order to increase two or three times the volume of world trade as between the Eastern half of the world and the Western half of the world, as between what you call the countries behind the Iron Curtain and the countries of "Western" democracy. If we do that, if we come forward to share in that trade we can increase the volume of world trade, we can raise the standard of living of our working people and we can make that contribution to that peace which we are not making. On the contrary what are we doing? From Egypt and Tunisia to Viet Nam what are we doing actually? In Egypt, I am sorry to say that when the anti-foreign riots took place in the City of Cairo on the 26th January, if I am not mistaken, our Government went so far as to join certain other unspeakable administrations to lodge a protest with the Government of Egypt. If I am mistaken I would certainly like to be corrected by the Prime Minister. In regard to Iran what did we do? Dr. Grady who was here as Ambassador of the United States has lately written an article on Iran, and he says—I will quote his exact words—that "the oil matter in Iran has become a symbol of the passion for complete economic independence which has developed not only in Iran but throughout the Middle and the Far East". But in regard to Iran we find that in June, 1951, I am quoting from one of the imperialist papers circulating in this country, "India has urged moderation while maintaining the justice of Persia's desire to nationalise her premier industry. Mr. Nehru is understood to have suggested the need for a mutually acceptable solution." For the lion and the lamb to lie together! Is this our tradition? Is this what we did in 1927 when the Congress under Mr. Nehru's auspices sent a resolution of protest because in Shanghai Indian military police were being used against the freedom movement of that country? Is this in conformity with the traditions which he helped in our country to develop through the instrumentality of the Congress during the thirties? It is not, Sir, and that is a matter for which we must hang down our heads in shame. In regard to Malaya what are we doing? The facts are common knowledge. The British themselves have admitted they are razing villages to the ground. They are practising chemical warfare in order that the food that is reared by the toil of the Malayan people should not be available to the common man. They are doing so because in Malaya the people have risen to expel the British intruder. What did we do? At one time we did begin well. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru took over the reins of Government he did say some very brave things but he did not live up to them later. Even after the so-called police action began in Malaya he went to Singapore and feasted and feted with the unspeakable representatives of British barbarity in that country, and even today we have not raised our voice against what the British are trying to do in Malaya. In regard to Korea? In regard to Korea my hon. friend, Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit said we did certain good things. Of course Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru has done certain good things. If he did not do those good things we would not be here, we know that if he was going absolutely the wrong way we would not be here, there would not be an opportunity of our coming here and talking under your auspices. He did certain good things about the atom bomb, he did say certain good things about crossing the 38th Parallel, he did certain good things as far as the diplomatic recognition of China was concerned. But basically where has he gone, where has he actually put himself? Why have we not even at this date withdrawn the Indian medical mission to South Korea? Do we not know the character of the rulers of South Korea? Do we not read it in the papers? *The Hindustan Times* is a very respectable paper which published in its issue of 5th June a very special report from the *London Observer* which said that Dr. Syngman Rhee is an absolutely

10 A.M.

impossible customer, that even in the South Korean Parliament a majority of people had voted in 1950, not long after the first operation started, saying that Syngman Rhee had actually started the hostilities in that country. Today you find that 120 Labour Members of even the British Parliament have said, "We cannot tolerate these atrocities which are happening in Korea and the kind of things the Americans have been trying to do in Koje Island." Field Marshal Lord Alexander might try to cover up things by going there and having a talk with the American representatives in order that the internal contradictions between the British and the United States interests could be smoothed over. But the Koje Island incident is such a serious thing that we certainly expected our Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to raise his voice of protest against this kind of treatment meted out to prisoners of war. And then in regard to bacteriological warfare? The charges of bacteriological warfare have been made not by Tom, Dick and Harry. Mrs. Pandit has just come back from China, she has shaken hands with Chou En Lai and Chairman Mao and the rest of them. Chou En Lai has issued repeated statements to the effect that bacteriological warfare is being practised. China is publishing material in plenty. Go to the Parliament Library, you will find *People's China*, which is after all a reliable document—we take it as an entirely reliable document—which will give you chapter and verse in regard to this question. Why do we not do anything about it? Why cannot we even say, "Here is a very serious charge which militates tremendously against the conscience of humanity, and as a people who, after all, are interested in maintaining and developing the values of human life we are raising our voice against it"? We are doing nothing of that sort, we cannot do it because we are today absolutely linked up with America. That is why Mrs. Pandit's successor in Washington said. "We have shed our inhibitions about the United States". That is why Mr. Chester Bowles—I am sorry to say anything against an Ambassador to this country—has the gumption to say from time to time that "in India the situation is bad, if India is lost to us the free world is gone; if India goes the China way the future of the world is absolutely dismal". Therefore, let not India go the China way and to prevent that we give you assistance! And President Truman said only the other day that the point of Point Four Programme and all the other assistance programmes is that we pursue the foreign policy of the United States of America. Have we become the instruments of the foreign policy of the United States of America? If we have it is a humiliation which we cannot stomach. We have not come here because we want to enjoy the lollipops which have been supplied to us by the Parliamentary confectionery of Great Britain. If we cannot concretise our freedom, if we cannot bring objective reality to the content of our freedom, then surely this freedom is nothing worth. But we can do so if we stand four-square to face the world, if we say that we are in the camp of peace, that we want peace with our neighbours, with Pakistan, with Ceylon, with Burma, with China, that we want peace all over the world and for that purpose we call upon the Great Powers to come to an agreement, to ban the atom bomb, to ban bacteriological and chemical warfare and to say that they are going to disarm straightaway in such a manner that the future of the world can really and truly be ensured. We do not do that, Sir. We do not do that—on the contrary what do we do? Our Home Ministry even goes so far as to say that if in this country international conferences are held and if foreigners come to this country, and if those foreigners happen to be foreigners from the Soviet Union or from People's China and the other "satellites" of the Soviet Union, that is the exact expression used in the official document, then prior intimation has to be given specifically in these very cases to the Home Ministry. We discriminate against these people. I know of cases and I have been personally a victim. I could not get a passport to go to the Soviet Union on invitation. I know of Soviet writers who wanted to come here. After all, they sang songs and wrote poetry. But they could not come to this country because visas were refused. We have asked questions about it here. but of course questions put here do not always lead to the kind of result we wish for. We are actively discriminating against the Soviets, People's China and the People's Democracies of Europe so far as our Government is concerned. And that is why today Mr. Chester Bowles and company have the gumption to say that India is on their side. If I remember aright, Mrs. Pandit sometime back had even given a list of instances when in the United Nations India had voted with the Soviet bloc and a list of cases in which India voted with the American bloc, and of course the number of cases when we voted on the American side was very very much greater. On the crucial issues, even though we fought in a fashion for the recognition of China, when the United States combination tried to blockade China to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

bring about the economic destruction of China, when we would have suffered directly and we were suffering directly on account of that economic blockade, we did not raise our voice of protest. We do not have an independent foreign policy. If we did have an independent foreign policy, we would say today, "Come what may, we stand for peace and for humanity, we stand for these values." We know our military strength to be very little. If any modern mechanised force attacks us, we shall be nowhere, unless we can mobilise the emotional resources of our people. But we can say at least this, that we put little store on these purely military preparations and that we stand for our great traditions and for the great future which our people had been promised when they took part in the fight for independence. That is why we want a really independent foreign policy today, which would mean our participation actively on the side of peace and against the war-mongers who are driving the world to desperation and death.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): I want to refer to three aspects of our foreign policy, *viz.* the means, the instruments and the objectives. According to the Opposition, the means at our disposal are colossal and enormous. They believe that our Army can conquer the world; that our Navy can cover the world; that our Air Force can go round the world. But our resources are limited. They do not realise that in the modern world the whole technique of war has been changed. The Army by itself cannot do anything. The Air Force has revolutionised the state of the world. Our expenditure on the Air Force is only one-ninth of the entire Budget. We have seen how a power like the United Kingdom was struck to its knees when the REPULSE and the PRINCE OF WALES—two big battleships—were sunk in Singapore by the superior might of the Japanese Air Force. My hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee said that we have spent money for taking the H. M. S. QUEEN ELIZABETH to the African waters, but he forgets that our ships have gone to the East. They have been to Thailand, Indonesia etc. They have won the goodwill of the peoples there. The money that we spend on our Navy is so very small—Rs. 11 crores out of a budget of Rs. 197 crores. The money we spend on our Air Force is Rs. 22 crores. Some people suggest an increase, but even this we are unable to maintain. How are we going to take any sides then in the race for armaments? The physical instruments at our disposal, namely, the Army, Navy and Air Force, are a bee compared to those of America or Russia, and with these small means at our disposal we have done a good job. Our foreign policy is based, after all, on the means at our disposal.

Our foreign policy cannot be divorced from realities. It has to depend on enlightened self-interest. It has to be independent at the same. Our foreign policy is not built on anger. We have gone down in our fights, but we have never got angry. We have had several nations of the world who have been overwhelmed with anger and indignation. Our foreign policy is built on the highest moral obligations. Even when we have been beaten, we have sought to help our neighbours. Our voice was raised on behalf of Tunisia and Morocco. Only during the last Parliamentary session our Prime Minister unequivocally took his stand on behalf of Morocco and Tunisia. We have neither the Armies nor the Air Force which can eject our invaders—the French and the Portuguese from India. We have the French boot on us in Pondicherry. We have the Portuguese heel on our knee in Goa. As long as we do not have sufficient military powers, we cannot say "Out with the French" or "Out with the Portuguese" and thus we cannot go to the help of Morocco or Tunisia.

India more than any other nation outside the Iron Curtain has had the maximum visitors from Russia. We have left our frontiers open for any visitors from Russia, be they artists, politicians, or people from other walks of life. We have allowed even our industrialists to go to Russia and have a look at their garden, the garden of roses, where I am sure there are as many thorns as there are in any rose garden. In view of this I do not understand my hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee's statement that our visitors have been barred to go to Russia. We have not barred visitors coming from Russia or from any other country.

Now, what is the instrument of our foreign policy? We hardly spend Rs. 7 crores on our foreign policy and this expenditure covers items like payments to tribal areas; payments to other countries: headquarters expenses Rs. 62 lakhs and about Rs. 239·45 lakhs on fifty-five missions abroad. Is that a large sum in a Budget of the huge dimension that we have? We have built our Foreign Service out of scrap. In 1947 when the British left, we did not have any machinery to lean upon. We had to send our best young men from public and the best men from the Indian Civil Service, and they won prestige for us. We have done this out of nothing and if within five years we have committed a few blunders. I want to ask you which service in the world does not commit blunders.

My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram spoke about the "whims and caprices" of our Prime Minister. Let me tell you a story. An author built up a large volume of the best writings in the world and he offered it as a homage to our Prime Minister. It was named the 'NEHRU ABINANDAN GRANTH" and was produced by author Dr. Lanka Sundaram. That was barely two years ago. I want to know what has happened during these two years which has made him to find out that our Prime Minister has got many whims and caprices.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker *in the Chair*]

These are facts which we cannot obliterate from our minds. A person who only two years ago dealt with all the various aspects of the greatness of our Prime Minister has gone over to the Opposition and speaks today of the latter's whims and caprices. He also accompanied the Prime Minister's sister on a U.N. Delegation only some time ago. I want my friends on the Opposition side to remember these facts.

My hon. friend Mr. Mukerjee spoke about Spain. We have heard about Spain. I was put up as a candidate during the elections in Bombay in 1937, at the time of separate electorates and I lost by one single factor and that was this. On the day of the election, a small pamphlet was circulated, which said: "Do not vote for the Congress. It has fought for the independence and freedom of Spain where priests and nuns were murdered." That finished my election with Catholics. So, if we have now opened a Consulate in Spain, it does not matter. We have our trade with Spain. We have Indians in Spain and we have lots of Spaniards coming over to India following different vocations. The Consulate is quite enough and it matters very little if an independent Embassy is not opened in Spain.

I want to refer to the 172 young men in our Foreign Service. My hon. friend said that they are ill paid; that they get less than our officers in the Indian Army. The highest officer in the Army, Navy or Air Force gets Rs. 3,000. The highest judge in the land gets Rs. 4,000 and the average judge gets Rs. 3,500 and both sacrifice a lucrative practice of Rs. 7,000 to Rs. 10,000 per month. They also are people who contribute to the national welfare. You cannot draw a line between martial and non-martial races. Our men abroad work under great difficulties. When countries like Russia and America spend enormous sums of money for publicity and other matters, our officers have to put their hands in their pockets and spend all the coppers with them for the sake of their jobs, for entertaining friends or senators in the interests of public relationship as hon. Shrimati Pandit mentioned just now.

I want to mention a few concrete achievements of our diplomatic representatives. My hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram talked of screening our diplomats. Screening is done everywhere. It has been done by the United States of America. Yet some of their diplomats have been fired before their Foreign Relations Committee. About England it is the same. But we do not know the number of undisclosed and unknown enquiries held in the British Foreign Office. Screening will also have to be done in the future in India. We should pick up some of the best men in public life. Some mistakes might have been made occasionally, but they have fulfilled their task with great splendour. Take our great Vice-President who was our Ambassador in Moscow. Marshal Stalin broke all conventions and saw him. His worthy predecessor, the great lady who was there before him could not see him because our country's attitude was not known. It was misunderstood. In 1947 things were not so bright as they are now. Our policy was not known to the outside world. It was not known to the masters of the Kremlin. The moment Russia appreciated our attitude they paid due honour to our representatives. We acknowledge the services of Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit and also Dr. Panikkar—whose advice on China even set the British Foreign Office working, in the sense that they took an open attitude about China only after our own Foreign Office took that attitude.

I talked of the living, let me talk a little of the dead. I would refer to two of our men who are unfortunately no more. Dr. Syud Hussain and Mr. Dhirubhai Desai—though there was an unpleasant chapter after his death. They were men who belonged to two different faiths but both were intensely patriotic. Dr. Syud Hussain carried on his burden with honour at Cairo. All Egypt went into mourning when he died because he was so popular and put the flag of his country high up in the Middle East. The same must be said of Mr. Dhirubhai Desai at

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Berne. Every Indian was welcome at his door, no matter from what small walk of life he came from India or abroad. These are positive achievements. I would like to close this point by referring to Mr. B. N. Rau who, to use the picturesque phrase used by Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit, by the still, small voice of India with which he spoke in the United Nations kept our flag flying. These are no small achievements.

Our foreign policy is not built on the strength of Navies which can be blown up by submarines, or the strength of the Air Force which can be battered down by the lack of petroleum or be destroyed by superior weapons, or by the strength of Armies which can be bombed from the dizzy heights of the air. It is not built on these physical instruments which can be destroyed. Our foreign policy has been built on the foundations of our moral power which has come down from centuries of Hindu philosophy of tolerance and the policy of 'love thy neighbour as thyself.' These are the great foundations of our foreign policy which Mahatma Gandhi handed over to his heir, and these we shall follow to the end. If today we lower the flag of tolerance, the policy of love thy neighbour as thyself, we shall come to the rank of a third-rate power. We are able to hold ourselves up today not because of our armies or weapons but by the strength of our moral grandeur, born of centuries of the spirit of tolerance and the spirit of love thy neighbour as thyself. These have really elevated us all. We have not been angered by any kind of insinuation or threat. We have kept our heads cool, and these have lifted us up in a manner that no country has been able to achieve.

I shall wind up with a few suggestions which I would like to make. As a back-bencher in the Indian Parliament I have a humble suggestion to make to the President and to the hon. the Prime Minister. We cannot exchange courtesies when the foreigner has kept his heel on our neck, on our head and on our body. In Goa the Portuguese have built powerful aerodromes. I represent Karwar, next to Goa and I can feel the thunder of the martial weapons more than anybody else. So also with respect to Pondicherry. The French are a great, courteous race; courtesies have flown from the French capital throughout the world. But we cannot exchange courtesies with them when they are keeping their heel on our head. We shall at least start by not exchanging courtesies on official days, to show the non-violent spirit of our protest. On the next National Day when it comes, we shall surely not send our greetings to France or Portugal, until they clear out of our land. Until they are ejected from our land we shall not be able to give any effective aid in regard to Morocco or Tunisia.

The second point is about the napalam bomb. After all the age of bombing has come. It has been done in Indo-China and other places. Unless we raise our voice of protest in time we shall not be able to stop the rot when it comes to the rest of mankind. It is better to give the warning in time than out of time. Perhaps the danger may then be saved in time. It will perhaps be better if an Indian Parliamentary Committee or a few Members chosen from all sides of the House are sent to Korea to find whether these allegations are true or not. No prestige of any foreign power will be involved if these charges are fairly and justly enquired into.

Lastly, in regard to our major Embassies I would like to say one word, namely that about ten of our Embassies should be manned by men drawn from our public life. It is true that we have burnt our fingers in the case of a few. But we cannot overlook the fact that men drawn from our public life who are inspired with an enthusiasm and zeal for their country can represent our country better than men drawn from the Services who have perhaps served their former masters with as much zeal as they serve us today. I want that in Cairo, London, Washington, Moscow, Peking, Paris, Rome, Jogjakarta, Karachi, Tokyo, Bonn or Berlin we should have as our diplomatic representatives men drawn from the public life of this country. It is better that these men who are fired with an enthusiasm and zeal for their country and who can represent the country wih effect and with vigour are sent to represent our country abroad to these named places instead of men who have made diplomacy as a career, or men from the Indian Civil Service.

One word more. The achievements of our foreign policy are great. Our Prime Minister's solemn warning that the 38th Parallel should not be crossed has passed into history. The warning was given at a historic period of world history and this shall ever remain in the pages of history.

Before I sit down may I mention a parallel? Someone asked Marshal Stalin—the story may be true or may not be true—someone asked Marshal Stalin "How long will the shooting of your enemies go on?" And it is said that he replied "It will go on as long as it is necessary". Someone asked Mahatma Gandhi "How long do you propose to reign over the hearts of men?", and he replied "As long as love lasts". Sir, that is our policy. This is the dividing line. Love rules our foreign policy, and that is the foundation of our foreign policy.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani (New Delhi): I rise to speak on this subject with a great deal of hesitation, particularly so because only to day we have heard the eloquent speeches, both from Mrs. Pandit and from this side of the House. I also know that our Foreign Minister is also our Prime Minister—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He is one of the biggest experts in foreign policy in this country. Even in the days when India was not free, he took a great interest on foreign affairs and even then he was considered an expert. So with great temerity, I rise to say a few words about his policy as it is worked out today in India. I claim no expert knowledge. My remarks would be confined to some of the things which I feel affect India very greatly and very closely. I will speak as a layman sees the execution of the foreign policy in India. What is the world scene? The dominant impulse in international relationship of modern world is conformity. Big powers are motivated by this impulse. Each one wants to have his own type of uniform policy all over the world. This theory has inherent conflict which leads to warfare, bloodshed and misery in the world. Because of this theory we see the world divided into two blocs, the Soviet Bloc and the Atlantic Bloc. Each bloc is trying to increase its own sphere of influence, for which I would use a more apt phrase of Mr. Acheson "each trying to seek situations of strength." The Soviet is trying to seek situations of strength in contiguous area and the Atlantic Bloc is trying to seek situations of strength in other parts of the world which have not yet come under the Soviet influence. Against this background India has emerged as a free State. We are motivated by ideas of love, non-violence, toleration and truth. Therefore, it was right that we initiated a policy of peace, a policy of non-alignment with any bloc and peace with all. We believe in the policy of co-existence. We believe that the Soviet and the Atlantic Blocs can live in peace together in the world. They do not preclude each other. But we have found difficulty in following this avowed policy because of the pressure of the blocs. We are afraid to displease any of the blocs: at the same time, we do not want to ally with any of the blocs. It is a very difficult task. It is like walking on the razor's edge. That is why I do not blame the Government much for always not coming up to the expectations of our people. Much credit goes for initiating this policy to Mr. Nehru, but the actual working of the policy has been marked with weakness and hesitation. In 1950 it appeared that our policy was of some service to Russia. But today the pendulum has swung to the opposite direction. In 1952 it appears that we have walked into the Atlantic Bloc or that we are so close to the Atlantic Bloc that the distinction is hardly visible. Let us see whether we are free to follow the policy we like, whether our foreign policy is really independent? Can we keep out of the war when a show-down comes between the two blocs? Of course, it is difficult to answer this question with certainty at any time. No country can do that but we have to see what is the totality of effect of Government policies and actions. Shall we be able to keep away from war or does 'the totality of effect' show that we are being gradually driven into the war? What is our position today? Let us analyse our policy of non-alignment. First of all I take the two big powers of the Atlantic Bloc, England and America. What is our relation with England? Being a member of the Commonwealth, however much we declare that we are independent, there is some basic qualification in our position of non-alignment. Being a member of the Commonwealth, we have to work in close co-operation with the Commonwealth countries. All the members of the Sterling areas have to work sympathetically with each other for their economic policy. We are part of the Colombo plan. All these go to integrate these countries together. Therefore we cannot say that we stand absolutely impartial between the two blocs or that our position is quite distinct between the two blocs. To add to this comes our long association with Britain. We have inherited the British military tradition. For our defence we depend a good deal on Britain's military strategy and equipment. I give you a small example. We entered into a tripartite treaty with Nepal and Britain after we became free. By this treaty we have given the British special facilities to recruit Gurkha soldiers on our land. Why? Which country allows another foreign country to recruit soldiers under these special facilities......

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I hate to interrupt, but that is not true, Madam.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I shall be very happy to stand corrected. Nothing would give me greater pleasure than that we are not giving extra facilities to England.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Nepal is an independent country and they can come to any agreement with any country. We do not come into the picture at all.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: But do not they recruit troops on our land?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: I am very glad to stand corrected.

An Hon. Member: They pass through our land.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: My information was that there are centres here, (India) where the recruitment goes on. It is not only that they pass through India. I made enquiries and I was told that the actual recruitment is carried in different centres in India.

An Hon. Member: It is all wrong.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani: If it is wrong, nobody will be more happy.

Let us take America. There has been a great deal of criticism about the taking of American aid. I am not opposed to American aid, as such. But if American aid implies that our freedom of action is hampered, then certainly, I have objection to the taking of such aid. Development projects are planned in such a way that we are dependent on American control and finance for their execution. I cannot go into details because I have no time. Not only we are depending on America for finance but the schemes that we have formulated are such as to make America's position increasingly pivotal. They control finance they also give us ideas as to how we are to act. Then we have invited new foreign capital in establishments on special terms, for example, the oil refinery in Bombay. We have given such extraordinary concessions that even the Manufacturers' Organization which stands to gain something from this venture have protested. Let us take the most sad part of it. Even for the development of our countryside we have not gone to our own plan. Gandhiji who lived and moved amongst us, carried on an immense experiment in village reconstruction and he has given us a well thought out plan for the comprehensive development of the villages. When our planners planned for India, they did not think it worth while to consider Sarvodaya programme as one of the plans for the development of our rural India. But where did we go? We went to America and we got the community project. In this community project we are dependent on American money, American technique and American moral leadership. Have we become so bankrupt that we do not know how we can solve our problems, we cannot tell India in what way we can develop our countryside? I could have understood all this if Gandhiji's great experiment had not been there. He left the seed here. It is for us to put the seed in the soil and water it. Then the plant will grow, but we want to bring a foreign plant and plant it in the soil of India. Most probably such a foreign plant will not grow; it may wither; it will not draw the energy that is needed to build up the nation.

Then there are other aspects. The agreement we have made for American technical co-operation we have given extra territorial rights to the Director and his staff. These rights are usually given to political diplomats. In the preamble of the agreement that we have signed there are political implications which are serious in nature. I do not know what is the significance of the American aid which we are getting. I am not opposed to the taking of it but I would like the house to know the source from which we are getting the aid. It is the **Mutual Security Act** of the **American Congress.**

It is not always good to take something from others and place oneself under some obligation. It might be there is no direct political obligation at the moment but, there is a moral obligation. No gentleman can take and not give anything in return. We are now taking. Will we not have to give something in return? Politics is dominated by principles of reciprocity, and not principles of philanthropy. I want to know to what we are committing ourselves when we are taking, and where we are going? We are increasingly losing our initiative for independent action and we are walking into the Anglo-American or the Atlantic bloc.

I have got some interesting figures about the export of strategic minerals, basic minerals needed for war production. We are exporting 1 million tons of manganese 1·4 lakh tons of ilmenite, 2·18 lakh cwt of mica and 24 to 30,000 tons of Kyanite, all very important war materials. To which countries do they go? Mainly to England and America to add to their stock-pile. Is this neutrality or non-alignment? What is the likely effect of this on the other bloc, Soviet Russia? This bloc, Soviet Russia is nearer to us geographically. We have contiguous boundary. I think this increases our vulnerability.

I want to make my position clear and my party's position clear. I am not one of those who say, let us join the other bloc. Not at all. If I do not want my country to walk into the glittering parlour of America, I do not want my country to be dragged into the backyard of Soviet Russia. I feel

India has got something to give, something to contribute to the world. We do not think that the solution of the world's ills lies either in Communism or in Capitalism. There is another way. Gandhiji showed that way, the way of non-violence, the way of peace and toleration. Let us stand firmly by these principles which we enunciated as the principles of our foreign policy. Let us show greater faith in those principles. Let us actively uphold these principles, not in a passive way, not in a hesitant way. Let us not be dragged or stampeded into any bloc. That is my appeal.

I would like to say a few words about our near neighbour, Pakistan. We must follow a policy of friendship towards Pakistan. We have been consistently trying to do that. But, peculiarly situated as we are, the fate of the minorities in eiher country has to be safeguarded by the two countries. We cannot be indifferent to the welfare of the minorities. I say with a good deal of hesitation that whenever a change has come in the existing situation, the change has been initiated by Pakistan and not by India. We have followed with protests, diplomatic pressure and what not. But, usually we have not succeeded much. It is Pakistan that has decided about every issue more or less. I might give as an example: the recent violation of the Nehru-Liaquat Pact by the imposition of passports on travellars. There has been a recent exodus of Hindus from East Pakistan to West Bengal. I came to know from this morning's questions the Prime Minister told us that they are going into the matter. I hope they will be able to arrive at some suitable settlement which will satisfy us. Otherwise, we are increasingly getting into a feeling of frustration. We feel that Pakistan decides every issue and we are not able to up hold our side. I would refer to another recent violation which is more serious: the introduction of separate electorates for the minorities in Pakistan. You know that the minority Members of the Fundamental Rights Committee there did not want separate electorates and strongly protested against it. Why is separate electorate being given to them? Not to safeguard their rights; but to segregate them, and to perpetually relegate them to a position of inferiority. We cannot sleep over these things. We have got to take action to better their lot. I know they are not our nationals. But, they were citizens of India. Because of this peculiar Hindu-Muslim question, we have to take some kind of special interest in this question, and try to see in what way we can protect their rights and we can give what is due to them. In the Nehru-Liaquat Agreement it has been clearly stated that "the Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunities with the members of the majority community to participate in the public life of the country, to hold political offices, and serve in their country's armed forces. Both the Governments declare these rights to be fundamental and enforceable." I feel that this Agreement has been violated by the recent move of Pakistan.

I do not want to take more of the time of the House. Finally I want to make this appeal. We can never be successful in our foreign policy unless the country is strong, united, and is economically and morally rehabilitated. We cannot economically or morally rehabilitate the country by depending on foreign loans, on foreign money, ideas and moral force. If the country is to grow, if the country has to develop, you have to draw upon the inner resources of the country, upon the inner energies of the country and her moral resources. You have to harness these energies. You must get the enthusiastic support of the entire country to ensure success in your foreign policy. We are in a very happy position, because of the great legacy that Gandhiji has left. Gandhiji has shown us the way by which we can reconstruct our country. My appeal to you is, do not throw away that legacy as something of not much worth. Please probe into it and see what a wealth Gandhiji has left. On the basis of his ideology we cannot only reconstruct this country, but we can also find a peaceful way for whole world and occupy a place in the world. As I have said already, he has shown us the new way, a way apart from that of communism and capitalism, a way of toleration, a way of peace, a way of non-violence. Let us not forget that heritage.

Prof. S. N. Mishra (Dharbhanga-North): From the time Sir William Harcourt said that we are all socialists, words have been changing their meanings and I am not surprised when some of my friends on the Opposite side have tried to confuse meanings or import meanings which are quite foreign to the words they use. In that confusion, my hon. friend Mr. Hirendra Nath Mukerjee confounded Consulate with Legation and probably it was in his zeal to give an opposite meaning to foreign policy that he has enunciated principles which are undoubtedly foreign to the policy we in this country can adopt. I am not also surprised when I find the polemics of cold war imported into this debate. My friends on the Opposition are fighting this cold war with all their adroitness and with all their zeal and therefore, if in the consequent climate of confusion

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

and prejudice on the other side they cannot see the fundamentals that underlie our foreign policy, they have only to thank themselves.

Yesterday, I was listening with attention and also with a certain amount of amusement when our hon. friend Dr. Lanka Sundaram was speaking. I was really wondering whether it was the same Dr. Lanka Sundaram who went to the United Nations as an Adviser to our Indian Delegation. Probably, in his zeal he made a trip from coast to coast telling the people that there was a three-pronged drive against the foreign policy of our Prime Minister: Russia, America and Indian capital. He was so brimful of praise for our foreign policy. I am really very amused to find that that brimful cup has been sucked so dry. I do not know what is the reason underlying it. Probably there is something more than meets the eye, and I shall leave it at that.

An Hon. Member: Why?

Prof. S. N. Mishra: When I think of India's foreign policy, I am reminded of a recent television interview in which Mr. Christopher Mayhew and our High Commissioner in London, Mr. Menon, had occasion to participate. Mr. Mayhew asked quite curiously—as he was in a sort of mystery because of the limited economic power and the military strength that India possesses—as to wherein lay the great power that India wields in the world politics of the present day. He was referring apparently to the attention and respect with which the voice of India is now heard in the forum of the United Nations, and he was also referring to the respect which was being paid in 10, Downing Street and other capitals of the world. Mr. Menon, in his observations, pointed out—I would be rather very discreet in imputing any observation to our diplomates—or more properly, he seemed to suggest that the economic power of the United States or the military power of Russia which seemed to wield tremendous influence were self-defeating, and it was ultimately the moral power that counted. This moral power of India is not a religious or mystic quantity. It does not come by way of illumination as it came to Moses years ago. But this moral power has been generated by various actions of India in the international sphere. India has always stood by the side of the weak, oppressed, and exploited nations of the world, and therein lies the solution to the mystery of Mr. Mayhew It is with this strength that India has been playing such a great role.

I want to say, Sir, that India may be lacking at the present moment in the material attributes which go to make a nation strong, but there is no doubt that India has become the lucid focus of intellectual and moral solidarity of Asia. And therefore I have always felt like congratulating the Prime Minister on a foreign policy which is not only sound in principles, but also eminently successful in its career. I have, always felt that this is a foreign policy which not only ensures prestige abroad, but also ensures social harmony and solidarity at home. Therefore, I had occasion to warn last year when I took part in the foreign affairs debate, that any attempt to tamper with the foreign policy of the country would only be at the cost of the solidarity and unity of the nation. I repeat that warning once again. I have been thinking all the time whether our foreign policy cannot, in a way, be said to foreshadow and epitomise a real Asian foreign policy. Herein we find the beginnings of a great Asian foreign policy, and I am tempted to remark that our Foreign Minister's name would join the blazing trail of history as the greatest architect of a great Asian foreign policy. It is in no spirit of simple panegyric that I have been saying this. I say this with confidence borne out by facts.

Many criticisms have been made, and I do not think I would be able to reply to most of them. But I want to take some of the major criticisms that have been made on the floor of the House. But, before I do that, I would like to say that during the last year our foreign policy has been more or less perfect—I speak particularly of last year because whenever we discuss foreign policy, we generally tend to go into fundamentals—so often enunciated and approved. We reiterate our fundamentals, or go on examining them over and over again. We Indians are fundamentalists by nature; we go to the beginning of the universe and soar as high as the stellar sphere or even beyond. But I submit, this is an occasion on which we should take stock of what were our achievements, or what were to our debits during the last year in the sphere of international politics. I think it was more or less a very perfect performance during last year. Whether you take India's stand about the San Francisco Conference or its peculiar progeny, the Japanese Peace Treaty about which its authors said "it is one of the most generous and benevolent acts of the present times", or whether you take the issue of Tunisia to which Mrs. Pandit referred, or you take that resolution on disarmament, I think all these go to prove that India really made great contributions to international politics last year. When I speak of this disarmament, I feel India provided a positive content to the pursuit of peace by that resolution, and it tried to convert the energy and wealth of the nations arming against each other into a war against want, misery and squalor of the under-developed countries. I therefore, think that this resolution will go down in history as one of the most remarkable resolutions.

But I do not mean to say that India's foreign policy was only of 'great and good stands' on various important issues in international sphere. I also take into account the fact that it was during last year that our foreign policy became economically fruitful. And time permitting, I shall also enter into that thorny controversy about foreign aid, but before I do that, I would like to dilate upon this point a little more, that our foreign policy became for the first time economically and materially fruitful. We find that so long the criticism has been that we have been following foreign policy which may be spiritually ennobling, but economically it has been crippling, sterile and even injurious. With the Colombo Plan of co-operative economic development of South East Asia and the Indo-U. S. Technical Co-operation Agreement, and also with the announcement by the Russian Ambassador, M. Novikov, some time back in Bombay that Russia was ready to enter into close trade and industrial relations with India and that she was also ready to provide us with the industrial equipments in lieu of any suitable currency, I think that a new chapter in our foreign policy is opening, and this is a very fruitful chapter. So our foreign policy has begun bearing fruit and I think that we have a more hopeful hereafter. The "Pravda" also only some time back referred to these questions of industrial and trade relations, and advocated that these trade relations should be ushered in at the earliest moment possible. So I would like to suggest to my friends sitting on the opposite side that with their liaison and over-brimming zeal, they should pave the way for over-ground trade relations with Russia. I underline the words over-ground trade relations.

But, Sir, this should always be borne in mind, and I would particularly bring it to the attention of our Foreign Minister: how did this foreign policy become economically fruitful? That was only when we showed our determination, after a long and faltering delay, to pursue an economic policy of development on progressive lines, when we showed our determination to resolve our economic problems with our own resources as far as possible, if no foreign aid was coming. We separated our Plan into two parts and said, foreign aid, well and good, and even if no foreign aid, we would push ahead with our own programme of development. With this firmness in the Five Year Plan coupled with the resolve to solve our economic problems with maximum economic justice in the circumstances possible, I find that the hiatus between the foreign policy and the domestic policy is being gradually reduced, and that for our foreign policy, a strong economic base is being built up. So it is this aspect of the foreign policy to which I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister. I would like to wish him good speed in this direction, so that the economic base of our foreign policy may be strengthened.

Sir, I now come to a connected topic, foreign aid and the apprehended dependence of our foreign policy. It has been said that the foreign aid is an evidence, a positive one, of our dependence on a power bloc and that it imposes a serious limitation on the much wanted independence of our foreign policy.

I am glad that the Foreign Affairs debate has come to a close on the heels of the debate on Defence estimates. Both these debates taken together will give us a complete and exact picture of the pattern of opposition and the strategy behind it. In our defence debate—I think I am not wrong when I conclude—they wanted us to limp on with our present equipment, and efficiency without taking any aid or assistance from outside. In addition, their demand was to cut down the defence expenditure to one-third of its present proportions. I cannot simply understand how our defences are going to be organised and how they are going to be built up unless we arrange to receive foreign assistance or guidance from countries which by long traditions of experience, training and technological advancement have come to acquire. This is a very potent question which must be directed to the attention of my hon. friends opposite. In this connection, I need hardly emphasize that we have not kept the door banged against any foreign country, if they are willing enough and good enough to help us. It is therefore very absurd to suggest that in the absence of any aid coming from any other quarter, we are attached to the apron-strings of any power bloc.

As in defence so in foreign policy, their prescription is very simple: "Do not adopt a policy which may yield political and economic dividends, which

[Prof. S. N. Mishra]

may make the country strong." That is their prescription. I, however, feel that a difference in approach to our economic development programmes will considerably reduce our dependence on foreign loans. After all what is the magnitude of the American aid that we are going to receive? Only Rs. 25 crores—an amount which the spinning-wheel of Mahatma Gandhi, given proper leadership and incentive, could earn during the course of a week. That question apart,—for that would only mean a digression when we are having a debate on foreign policy—I would simply say that if Russia could be in need of foreign capital in the initial stage of her development and if other countries attached to Russia are still receiving it, I do not know what sensible objection could there be to our doing the same. I have also in my mind the example of the development of the United States of America which was built up with the capital of the United Kingdom, and the U.S.A. is not in any way dependent upon the U.K. economy. But the fact is rather the reverse of it, and the United States of America now emerges as one of the greatest military and economic powers of the world. I can multiply instances like that. There is also the instance of Canada.

The upshot of all Communist arguments about our Defence and Foreign policy is very simple and clear and let there be no delusion about it. For political and other reasons not precisely known to me, but certainly more than precisely known to my hon. friend Dr. Satyanarain Sinha, they want our defences to be weak and ineffective and our foreign policy barren and enslaved to the bloc of their persuasion. We have absolutely nothing against Russia or against any other power bloc. We simply want to pursue a path of our own. I think this is a remark which I cannot help making.

It has been suggested that our foreign policy is not independent. I do not think I have much to say about it, as so many eminent speakers on our side who have spoken earlier have contradicted it, with all the emphasis at their command. But I would simply point out one instance in this connection which I feel, would be appropriate. When both America and Russia were agreed on the partition of Palestine and the setting up of the State of Israel, India differed from both these points of view, and offered a federal solution of her own to the Palestine problem? Is it not a clear proof of the independence of our stand?—I ask.

Also, when our Prime Minister wrote letters to Stalin, Acheson, and Attlee, Stalin in his good message reciprocated our sentiments. If India was attached to any particular power bloc, I have absolutely no doubt that Stalin would not have reciprocated our sentiments. I find, therefore, that some of my hon. friends on the other side are out-Stalining Stalin. That is the stage to which they have come.

11 A.M.

Lastly, I would hurriedly make some suggestions, as the time at my disposal is rather short. I agree with Dr. Lankasundaram's suggestion when he says that there should be a Committee of this House set up for the study of important questions in international relations, to give its considered views to our Foreign Minister on various issues. I do not know whether, what I have stated is identically the same as my hon. friend Dr. Lankasundaram's suggestion. If there is such a Committee set up, it should be given the fullest opportunity for the study of available materials and data, so that they can contribute to the making of the foreign policy in consonance with public opinion.

My second point is that Government should encourage non-official institutions in this country to carry on research on different important topics in international affairs. I have in my mind, in this connection, certain instances in other countries. Take for example the Institute of Pacific Relations in the U.S.A., Chatham House of U.K. and the People's Institute of Foreign Affairs in modern China. They are all doing thundering good work and their opinion is influencing the decisions on foreign policy in those countries. I would only request the hon. Prime Minister to see whether some such encouragement could not be given to non-official institutions in this country also to carry on research on international affairs.

Then, I do not feel happy about the 'Historical Division' of the External Affairs Ministry. I do not mean anything particular against its working. But I am simply amazed as to its name. What is it about It sounds like 'Archives, or a Museum'. My suggestion is that it should be called the 'Research Section' of the Ministry of External Affairs, and its working also should be improved to some extent. It should not be simply called upon to provide background material and information, but it should also anticipate events and offer remedies in advance.

My last word is about one aspect of our embassies. I feel that they should be strengthened in their commercial sections, particularly in countries of Europe where there is not much of diplomatic activities or relations due to their neutral character. It is the commercial section which should have a predominance in those countries. If we do that, I am sure that would contribute very much to the material advancement of India.

In the end, I want to congratulate our Foreign Minister again for his very successful foreign policy, and I am deeply thankful to you, Sir, for all the goodness you have shown towards me.

Shri Khardekar (Kolhapur *cum* Satara): Yesterday one hon. Member on the other side told us a very good 'cock and bull' story and tried to show that whatever was said from this side, if it was new, was untrue and if it was true, it was not new. I do not propose to say anything new. Nowadays originality really means resorting to the trick of concealing origins. Even this sentence is not my own. It comes from *Joad*.

I am going to be concerned really with the very important and perhaps the most important and the biggest question of world peace. I am not going to bother myself about the amount to be spend on the embassies. It was refreshing for me to know from one hon. lady Member, a very important lady Member, that however ultra-modern our Indian woman may be, she essentially retains her love of cooking.

It was really very refreshing. Sir, our foreign policy aims at peace, and peace for the whole world, not only for India. Many of us may differ with regard to the means and methods, but I do not think anyone of us here disapproves of this important aim or ideal. Now, the point is how to implement it? That is the most important question and I have something to say about it.

Now it has been stated by many that we are being friendly towards all nations and that our method is one of non-violence. Considering the weight of evidence, perhaps it might be said that we are leaning a little on the side of the Anglo-American bloc. But, Sir, it may be due perhaps to the force of circumstances. I am not in the know of all particulars and details, as some of my friends here are, but when there is this sort of feeling or suspicion, perhaps well grounded, I may say, my request to the Prime Minister is to maintain clear and absolute neutrality and have equal friendship with all nations. I admit we have championed the cause of China and so on. We have done our duty to those countries, but we have shown a little more leaning, a little more attraction as regards America and England. Some countries probably might laugh at us for our non-violence. Non-violence of the weak has no meaning. But I may here make a statement which some of us may not like. As Indians, as individuals, I personally think we are far inferior to Europeans. But as a nation we have a very unique position. As a nation, I think we are in certain most important respects far better than some of these wicked war-mongering nations. In trying to solve our problem, we shall be really solving the problem of the world. In approaching this problem, I want that we should be above party politics and we should give to mankind what mankind needs rather than lose ourselves in parties.

Now, Sir, my solution is rather one that perhaps might not be liked by many persons and that is, the complete elimination of the nation as a political entity. The vicious system of sovereign States has to be wiped out. That is my thesis and I will try to develop it as far as possible within this short time. I was rather pained to hear my friend, Dr. Lanka Sundaram, a highly cultured person stating that it is a question of 'my country right or wrong'. This is what leads to the whole trouble. Man is the one peculiar animal who has got the capacity to go towards God, Godhead—even those who do not believe in God · towards perfection—or even to surpass the devil. Now, my friend said 'My country right or wrong'. My friends here will say 'Hindus right or wrong'; other friends will say 'Muslims right or wrong'; some others will say 'Brahmins right or wrong' and some others will still go on narrowing themselves and ultimately will say 'Myself right or wrong'. So one can become an absolute devil and even surpass the devil. The importance of human life lies in extending the boundary of our sympathies, of our affections and of our love. As Swami Rama Thirth has said, from love to toys to the love of boys, to the love of village, then country, the world and the Universe; there should be no limit and man should go on progressing and progressing for ever. If we are going to continue this vicious system of sovereign States, I do not think there is any possibility of peace for the world. I can say this from a number of examples. First of all, how did these institutions like the nation or State come into existence? Man has invented and established these institutions. If they are going to destroy him as we found in Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy when the State became something superhuman, metaphysical and a gaint machine, in which the individual was completely crushed and was made a mere cog in the

[Shri Khardekar]

gigantic wheel, do we want anything like that?

After all it is necessary for us to see the history of these sovereign States. For that purpose it is necessary to refer to the history of Europe because all political progressive ideas, one has to admit, have come from Europe. Seth Govind Das may not agree. Perhaps he will have his ideas only in Hindi. Before the Reformation there were particularly Estate States—they were not really States in the modern sense. Influences which hampered and retarded the development of the State were the Church and Feudalism. Feudalism meant really the negation of the State, and the Church always tried to trespass on the rights of the civil administration. So it is only in the firmament of the Renaissance and the Reformation that the modern State came into being—a State, powerful, centralised and sovereign. Now once you had a centralised powerful State and when there were a number of States due to facilities in communication and trade relations naturally the States had to come in conflict with each other and the old Christian background having disappeared, people had to find out some new methods of approach and several means have been tried.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: On a point of order, Sir. Is this speech consistent with the oath of allegiance we have taken to the Constitution of this sovereign State of India?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Quite consistent

Shri Khardekar: Yes. So that is the whole [illegible] civilised man has to fight against, this poison of narrow sectarianism, communalism, casteism and all that. That is the danger. If somebody says 'I will hit you' 'if you hit me' that sort of animal ferocity is really the poison. I mean patriotism in this sense is nothing but—as somebody said—a virtue among barbarians.

I was talking about the nation after the Reformation and Renaissance. The nation became sovereign. The Christian background, the religious tie, disappeared after the Reformation and a number of remedies were tried. For instance, a wider unity was found in the international law. But everybody knows what international law is. There is no time to talk about it, but international law has been said to be no law at all; it is only positive morality, but I think it is not even positive morality because the European nations have shown a morality which is not even as good as that of the robbers. Therefore, there is no international law whatsoever. Then look at the number of other remedies sought after. Look at the League of Nations. For want of time, I have to cut short. The League of Nations was founded entirely on foundations of sand. It was meant to prepetuate a wrong committed by the Treaty of Versailles which was really a treaty of robbers for robbing the down-trodden. Therefore, we found it was unjust in principle. Then after that, we may come to a number of other remedies. Take, for instance, the UNO. I mean, it is much better founded than the League of Nations, but I do not think it is as effective as it should be.

Now my point—I just come to the important point—is that the European nations have shown selfishness and they have been trying to create trouble. We as individuals are not very good, but I do think the individuals in Europe if approached properly and told that the nations or Governments are really having their own ideas, may be able to put an end to war and conflict. I will give one or two instances. Now, Sir, after the first World War, a plethora of anti-war books appeared and inundated the market and I particularly would refer to one of the incidents in one of these books which will represent my views on this point. During the war 1914 there was a good deal of propaganda. The war was meant to end war. The war was meant to make the world safe for democracy. The war was meant to make everything safe for civilisation. Now all this tall talk had enthused certain enthusiasm into young men—young men from the Universities like Oxford and Cambridge. A good deal of hatred on the English side was bred about the Germans. The same was done by the Germans—probably twice the quantity. Now the result was......

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it all relevant to our foreign policy?

Shri Khardekar: Yes, Sir, it is very relevant to our foreign policy. A German youth was being killed by an English undergraduate and because of the propaganda that was instilled in his mind, the first idea in the mind of the Englishman was to go and, stamp on the face of the German youth because all that was German was poisonous and absolutely most rotten for him. Now when he looked at the face of the German youth, he saw something good; something kind. What the German youth then began to do was that he took out a photograph of his mother from his pocket and gave it to the undergraduate and said: "Take this photograph to my mother and say to her that I died in peace and the person who killed me was very kind to me and so on". Now this created almost a revolution in the mind of the undergraduate of the Oxford University. He said "Well, all that I had heard about the Germans being a monster and so on was propaganda made by the Government. The German individual is as good as any other individual." So let us bring some sanity unto the Government, and let the Prime Minister, particularly our Prime Minister go round preaching this gospel of peace rather than merely trying to bring about heterogeneous groups together and trying to put an end to rifts here and there. He should not give up for a party what belongs to mankind and that is my humble suggestion. So, Sir, if we want peace, I think this vicious system of sovereign States—thereby I do not mean that nations should discontinue. Nations should continue as cultural units. Each nation should contribute its best in art, in science, in literature. Let England give her lyric poetry, her subtle sense of humour and her political consciousness, also her Scotch whisky. Let France give her exquisite prose, her paintings and her champagne and let India give her spiritual valves to the world, but let us not have humbug also.

Shri Gohain (Nominated—Assam Tribal Areas): I am thankful to you, Sir, for giving me an opportunity to speak on behalf of about a million hill population of the Part B tribal areas, that is, the North East Frontier Agency.

As you know, I come of this very backward part of this vast country and I bring a message of fellowship to this House from the illiterate people of these steep hills, the neighbouring regions meeting Tibetan countries on the North and the republic of Burma on the South East.

During the British administration these vast areas of hilly lands were looked upon only as a buffer zone between the powerful countries and hence, no one thought about the development of these parts of our country.

Now, with the beginning of our national era, we find these tracts of lands have been considered as a part and parcel of this Union of Republican India. And I am thankful to the national leaders that gradually civil administration has been introduced into these tribal lands. As we remember the plains portion of these so-called excluded areas have been already assimilated recently with the State of Assam. And this was a welcome step for raising the level of administration of the tribal areas to that of the entire country.

Now, Sir, the North East Frontier Agency consists of six Districts, namely—Balipara, Subansiri, Abor Hills, Mishmi Hills, Tirap Frontier Tract and Naga tribal areas. And each District has its own population different from the rest with distinct dialects and peculiar habits, manners and customs foreign to each other. You will find in their dialects, manner and customs, a mixture of Tibetan and Burmese blends.

It is correct that these people are tribal and primitive in their ways of life. They are illiterate, ignorant, most unbiased and faithful. Sir, you will find in them a spirit of independence, courage and enthusiasm, which if you properly direct will be a great national asset of our sovereign democratic India. Truly speaking, they are the frontier guards of our national strategy.

Now, these people are very badly in need of some things for their full development. For physical, cultural and mental uplift, they need a dispensary at every nook and corner. They need easily accessible schools for their children and road communication to each village.

They want greater facilities for primary education. Moreover adult education should be spread in the entire tribal Hills. To give them encouragement in education not only free education but free books, stipends and dresses must be granted. Hostels may also be built.

Then to link entire areas of the Agency and give them facilities for easy transport of things, roads must be constructed at all costs. These roads, Sir, will serve as strategic lines also which is very essential to our national defence. In order to fight hill diseases, hospitals must be established at every point of the hills.

Above all the Government should give more agricultural help to the hill people, so that they may make themselves self-sufficient in food. Therefore, large amount should be granted annually, so that their all-out advancement can rapidly be effected. During the last two years or so, these hills had been the most helpless victims of the last great Earthquake and consequent floods. Thousands of poor tribal people of the Abor and Mishmi Hills died without being seen by human eyes. Their homes doomed and the cattle and other properties washed away by these unprecedented calamities. Vast tracts of lands with crops growing thereon, torn into pieces and arvaged and the system of communications entirely dislocated time. There was the wagon problem—the problem of raw materials which were needed for stockpiling mainly for war-purposes or something else. It does not matter to this country so long as we are in a position to send something to another country which will save us from borrowing for buying food supplies. Even today I maintain that we are in a position to export manganese—I do not know whether for war production—I do not think manganese is used only as an instrument of war; it is used for peace also. Government should encourage the export of things which in no way denude our wealth or our strength.

Having said that much, I want to come to a problem which relates not so much to foreign policy as to something which I think the Prime Minister should pay his attention to. It is a matter on which I have kept silent ever since we attained independence. But I would like to ask the Prime Minister, now that we are a little more settled and are able to think and behave more reasonably, to explore whether or not the time has come to review the fate of the Chittagong hill tracts. A particular commission was appointed years ago, before partition. At that time I asked the Prime Minister whether the Chittagong hill tracts would come under the review of that particular commission. He, in the goodness of his heart and the tremendous faith he has about things, sometimes gets misled, but, at any rate on this particular issue, he told me quite clearly that he did not see how the Chittagong hill tribes could ever come within the purview of that particular Commission which was going to decide the partition of Bengal. We all know what happened: the people were lighting fires, putting the Indian flag up, only to wake up next morning and find themselves on the wrong side of the boundary. I would like our Prime Minister—there may be no rush, mad rush for it—to tell us whether the time has not come for him to negotiate about this. Obviously we are committed to a path of peace. It is not a question of walking across to Rangamati, or something like that, to liberate 98 per cent. of the people there who are non-Muslims, mostly Buddhists. I am not thinking in terms of war but it is grave injustice to have put the Chittagong hill tribes on the other side of the frontier.

I would only say that and end up with a defence which is hardly necessary but which becomes necessary because of some unwise things that my friend, Mr. Joachim Alva, has said. He somehow or other was not very complimentary to the service men in their capacity to represent us in various foreign assignments. He gave us a list of various countries where he thought public men should be assigned and not service men. I am one who knows the weaknesses of our services but who also acknowledges the weaknesses of our public men, and this discrimination, this insidious discrimination is quite uncalled for. Overnight we had to have an Idian Foreign Service. The Political Department in the previous regime was closed to Indians, and it was not very easy for our new Government to build up a cadre. But on the whole I would say this much that the service men have acquitted themselves far more creditably, in my opinion. I say that from what I know and what other responsible people say about them. I would suggest to the Government to see that the Indian Foreign Service is expanded, very largely expanded. At the present moment I do not think it is in a position to meet even the present requirements. And in the choosing of the personnel I do hope there will be something like a job analysis which obtains in the selection to the Armed Forces. That is very necessary. We must not merely go by the superficial credentials such as the kind wherewith my friend, Mr. Joachim Alva, is so anxious to adulate public men. Public men by themselves may not be able to serve the way the Indian Foreign Service should be served. I do hope, Sir, that more serious attention will be paid to the strengthening of the Indian Foreign Service.

With these words, I have great pleasure in congratulating particularly the Prime Minister, not because I approve of his foreign policy—I simply do not understand it—but there is one thing I can sincerely say, that is, his policy at any rate has succeeded, and that is good enough as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will call on Mr. Thanu Pillai. I was informed that he had a special representation to make on a particular subject. He should confine his remarks to not more than five minutes.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I am very grateful to you for having given me an opportunity for at least five minutes to remind this House about the people who have been forgotten. People talk of workers of the world, people talk of Russia and China, but they forget the people of India who are overseas who are fighting for their very existence. It was the feeling for these people which made me beg of you for five minutes and say a few words of remembrance of our people

[Shri Thanu Pillai]

abroad. In these last five years from the position of discrimination the status of those people has degenerated into one of total annihilation. What little they had by way of representation and right of franchise and other things has been taken away in a country like Ceylon. A struggle for existence, a satyagraha movement is going on there, but world policies and international policies and all that has blurred the vision of the workers' representatives to say a few words about them. Maybe I feel so much for them but that may be due to the fact that I was connected with them, I have been there for a considerable length of time. Indians abroad are expected to be ambassadors of this country and its thought. I am proud to say that our people in Ceylon are the real ambassadors of our country there. They do not belong to that class of people who agitate with reason and without reason, who resort to things which are alien to our culture and tradition, which will be alien to truth and non-violence that has been given to us as a weapon to fight for our independence or for enabling us to find a better existence. They are wedded to the principle of truth and non-violence as modelled by the Congress, the mighty organisation of India. Those people are watching what we are going to do for them. Not that they want an army to go and march in there—they do not want that, they do not want that our people should go there and swarm that country and enable them to become a majority community there. But the sympathy that would be given to other nations should be extended to our people there. The sympathy that we extend to Indo-China, Tunisia and all the countries the world over, that simple principle of remembering them and giving our moral support to them at least should be extended to them. If it is a question of foreign policy and of advising two friends one of whom is the exploiter and the other exploited, I would say that we were friends of the Dutch and of the Indonesians but still we brought about a reapproachment by our policy. But if we apply the same principle in the case of Indians domiciled in a foreign country and say that we cannot interfere because they are a foreign nation, then these helpless people will be the nationals of neither that country of adoption nor of this country of their origin. In this case, between India and Ceylon their position is fast going down. Our approach to this problem therefore cannot be the same as that between two foreign countries, as between Indonesia and Holland because we are not a third party to the dispute but we are one of the two parties directly concerned. These people are denied certain rights because their country of origin was India, their forefathers were born in India. In the cases the Indians in Ceylon, at least 60 to 70 per cent. of the present generation, were born in Ceylon. Inspite of the fact that they were born there and they have pledged their loyalty to and worked for the betterment of the country they have not been able to live there as peaceful citizens.

As the five minutes are over I shall conclude I shall avail of another occasion to speak on this matter. I thank you again for having given me an opportunity to speak. I expect my leader to take full note of the situation and of the fact that we are a party to the dispute and must therefore deal with the situation as such and seek a solution here and now. If this question is not settled during his period it may end up in a world conflagration for which the mighty India of the future may make this an excuse as the Germans did of the Sudetan problem.

Dr. S. P Mookerjee (Calcutta-South-East): In the very short time at my disposal it is hardly possible for me to touch more than a few points arising out of the foreign affairs budget. In the course of the debate yesterday and today, naturally Members speaking on behalf of Government have referred to the complete success which has been attained by the Prime Minister in the pursuit of his foreign policy. There have been trenchant criticisms also. I would like to judge the matter by the results actually achieved. Undoubtedly, many foreign critics have said good things about India. I do not ignore the difficulties through which the Government had to pass. We had no foreign Department as such. We had to build up the whole thing from scratch. We had no men at our disposal, whom we could send out as our Ambassadors. We were lucky in eliciting the services of some distinguished men from this country, the most notable of whom was undoubtedly Prof. Radhakrishnan, who carried with him universal goodwill and a reputation which was second to none in the whole of this country. I do not ignore the fact that the situation in the world today is also extremely difficult and delicate. It looks as if we must either support America or we must support Soviet Russia. It looks as if the world is divided into two watertight compartments. If you are not my friend, you are my enemy. Well, it is a very difficult state of affairs, particularly for a country such as ours with obvious limitations. Our defence is extremely weak. We may be spending about Rs. 180 crores a year, but we have no defence industries as such. We are dependent for the supply of our arms and ammunition on foreign countries. We have even started getting our food from foreign lands. Many of our development plans are linked up with large and abundant supplies of foreign aid These are symptoms which make one feel nervous as to how far in the actual application of our policy we can maintain that independence which the Prime Minister claims he would like to maintain on all occasions. But, as I said, I would like to judge our foreign policy in respect of matters nearer home.

We have talked a lot about matters throughout the world. One of the speakers today spoke about One World civilisation and one World government. For that, he need not have quoted from outside authorities. Even in our country from time immemorial the sages sang the song of *Vasudeva-kudumbakam.* They treated the whole world as belonging to one family. Still, those are difficult things. It is no use India alone saying that she would like to have a One World government if all other big countries are not prepared to adopt the same policy. But if we want to judge our foreign policy with regard to our actual performances nearer home, we are confronted with a policy of negation—hot words and cold feet. That summarises the actual realisation of the results of our foreign policy. What happened with regard to Kashmir? A part of our territory is still in the occupation of the enemy. We have appealed in vain to foreign countries, to Big Powers belonging to all classes for help and support. But years are rolling by and yet there is no early sign of a solution. Which other country would have tolerated a situation like this, when a part of our own declared territory is in the occupation of the enemy, and enemy who is real, *viz.* Pakistan? Our dealings with Pakistan are extremely funny and doubtful. We are friends at night and enemies in the day. There are certain periodical approaches and for some months we are friends and for some months we are enemies, and that is the country which is now occupying a part of our territory.

What is happening with regard to East Bengal? The other day the Prime Minister got angry and he challenged the figures. There might have been some misunderstanding, but so far as the net result is concerned it is something which must cause genuine anxiety to any Government. We had a Pact with Pakistan in 1950. Now, the minorities are being pushed out of that part of Pakistan and we are getting evidence of the Sinister plans of Pakistan. Large numbers are going from this side and large numbers are coming from that side. I was in Calcutta only two days ago. I went and saw Sealdah station. If you go there, any if you go to the border stations, you will find that thousands are coming away from Eastern Pakistan with the same stories of persecution and squeezing out from that territory, and they are coming here as a terrible burden upon India in utter violation of the Pact which had been entered into between the two Prime Ministers in 1950. Those reports are coming to us. Are you completely helpless? Can there be no remedy? Who are these people? The Prime Minister described them at one time as 'aliens', as foreigners. Well, technically they may be so, but assurances were given to them—solemn assurances—by the same Prime Minister and by others that they would be protected and if necessary India will be prepared to take full responsibility for that purpose. Are you so helpless? I again ask. I am not saying that you should declare war tomorrow, but there may be so many other remedies. What is the good of sitting in an atmosphere of complete helplessness and saying that we cannot do anything? We can only, send appeals, and the appeals would be summarily rejected. Is there any reciprocity in treatment? The other day Pakistan refused permission to our planes to go to Afghanistan. What did you do? You ran to the International Court of Justice. Could you not at least prohibit the Pakistan planes' flying over India, even for twenty four hours? Could we not have done that? Could you not say, "You are violating a basic international agreement and we are not going to allow your planes to pass over India." At least, we could have done that, but that required some guts; that required some courage, and of course that was not available.

Now, it is not about Pakistan alone. What is happening with regard to the foreign pockets in India? What is going to happen with regard to their future? Is there any firm policy? The Prime Minister said the other day that other methods would have to be adopted, but immediately added that other methods meant always peaceful methods. We do not mind what methods they are, but these pockets have to disappear from the soil of India. That must be one of the basic elements of the foreign policy of Free India. Those pockets have no legal or moral right to continue as separate entities. There must be a firm declaration of policy from the Government, followed by necessary action, so that they may be liquidated within a given period. But here again what is the policy adopted? In this very report about foreign affairs that has been

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

circulated to us it is stated in one portion that Portugal declined even to discuss the matter with us some time ago. The Government of India sent a memorandum and Portugal declined even to discuss this matter with us. In another portion of the same report it is stated that India has entered into a special agreement with Portugal for an abundant supply of sterling loan to Portuguese India. So, what is the policy? What necessity was there for the Indian Government to enter into a special agreement with the Portuguese Government so as to facilitate their trade or other activities when on the basic principle Portugal was not even prepared to discuss matters wih us?

We are told that our foreign policy has been a grand success. We are getting chits and certificates from others. Undoubtedly, on many occasions bold stands have been taken. But that is all a theoretical, abstract approach. How are we treated? How are Indians treated throughout the world wherever they are staying? The last speaker made some reference about the Indians living in Ceylon, South Africa, etc. We read in the report that negotiations are still going on for the better treatment of Indians in Gibralter. There also, they are not receiving their due, which is their birthright. Everywhere we are getting kicks. Indians living in all parts of the world are not receiving their fair share, they are not receiving a fair deal, and yet our foreign policy has tremendously succeeded; our reputation has gone up and is going up. It is going up to such an extent that wherever Indians are living, they are not treated honourably; they are not given their birth-right or other advantages due to them. Why? What is the reason? Why is it that everyone is looking at us suspiciously? We have talked about these blocs. I hold the view that India must remain independent. There is no question of our joining with any bloc. We are not interested in any bloc as such. It should not be suggested that we must give up all association with America and accept an invitation from the Soviet bloc to go there. Let us remain where we are. To that extent any efforts made by the Prime Minister will receive support from all enlightened sections of the people of this country. But that must be followed up by straightforward, honourable action, fearless action whenever our self-respect is affected and when our rights are trampled under foot. My charge against the Prime Minister is that although he has talked big about various matters—his enunciation of principles may be sound—but when it comes to the question of application of those principles to particular cases, especially where it concerns the rights of Indians, whether here or abroad, or of those people on whose sacrifice freedom has been achieved (and people are adorning the Treasury Benches today through that tremendous sacrifice) wherever such cases have come, somehow he has shrunk and he has not been able to carry out his policy into execution. And that is how the people of this country will judge him and his foreign policy.

The question is about our continuance in the British Commonwealth. I was in the Government when this decision was taken nearly four years ago. I know the circumstances under which this very big decision had been taken. But has not the time come, I ask the Prime Minister, to review the whole matter and to see dispassionately how India has fared by remaining within the Commonwealth? Draw up the balance-sheet. Has it helped us, or has it hindered us? In the delightful speech which Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit delivered this morning she mentioned in one place how on many crucial occasions the entire Commonwealth countries voted against India. You say that your policy has succeeded, you say that your policy is applauded. But when occasions come when you stand up for what you consider to be right and just, you are alone, friendless. That is the success of your policy! You are alone, and the other countries do not come near you. So, what is the measure of judging the success of your policy? That is the question which has to be answered by the Prime Minister. It is no use getting chits and certificates from outsiders. There are various reasons why they are freely distributed. We must not take up this stand of the Grand Guru of the world. We cannot afford to take the stand of an adviser *par excellence* for the whole world. We know our limitations; we know where we stand. The reason why we say that we should come out of the Commonwealth at this stage is that it has not helped us at all. On every crucial occasion the Commonwealth countries have failed to stand by India where India's stand has been right and just. It does not mean that we will become anti-British. Burma has come out of the Commonwealth. And Burma is still respected by Britain, America and the rest of them. If we remain outside the Commonwealth it means that we will be able to negotiate with every country. I am not afraid of receiving foreign aid from any country. Why should my friends be nervous that America is offering us aid? It all depends on what conditions it is offered. If we suffer from an inferiority complex, or if we want to sell our country to any foreign country, undoubtedly that will be reprehensible and India will not accept or tolerate such a position. But if foreign aid is offered unconditionally and in order to develop our own national resources and build our own economy, especially to remedy the economic poverty that faces the people of India, we should not refuse it. But let us maintain our independent status and behave as such. That is the reason why I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the time has now come for him to consider this matter dispassionately, and quietly—without much declaration—quietly come out of the Commonwealth, whether it is called British or un-British matters little. And we shall remain friendly to those countries which are our friends. That is the test which I put. One hon. friend said yesterday that our great policy is that we are friends of everybody. If you try to be friendly to everyone you will soon find yourselves in enormous trouble. The test is you will have to be friendly to those who are your friends, and you will have to measure your strength when occasion arises.

12 NOON

I will conclude by saying this that the test of the success of our foreign policy will depend how far we have been able to strengthen the national base within the country. We have no army worth the name. We have no defence industries worth the name. We have to depend in the ultimate analysis on the great moral strength of the people of India. And so far as the foreign policy is concerned it should not be a closed book. I do not know whether the Standing Committees will be selected or not. But there should be the closest contact between the Government and all parties in Parliament in the discussion of the foreign policy of the country. We do not want that occasions should arise when the country's foreign policy should be discussed in an unfriendly way, which will strengthen the hands of our enemies abroad. Take us into your confidence. Appreciate the point of view that we may have. It is not our individual point of view but the point of view of a section of the people over whom you are ruling as their representative for the time being. Proceed on that basis and pay the greatest possible attention to our home requirements. Consolidate the home front, turn your attention to the grave economic problems that face India today, and particularly take in hand in the next year the solution of these problems which are affecting the daily lives and existence of millions of Indians who today by an accidental chance have been thrown out of the Indian soil. Take up their cause; forget for the time being the rest of the world. And, do not talk so much. I do not know of any Foreign Minister in the world who makes so many speeches as our worthy Prime Minister does. If he kindly speaks a little less than what he does on foreign matters, it will create less confusion and misunderstanding.

One last word about Tibet. None has spoken about Tibet. There was peaceful penetration of Tibet by China. I have great admiration for the Chinese people; I have great admiration for the way in which China is being developed now. But here also our Prime Minister practically acquiesced in the slavery of Tibet. Tibet has suddenly become a province of China. There has been slow penetration into Tibet, and the new maps which are prepared by China include even Bhutan as part of China. These are ominous signs which it will be for us to tackle. Look at the huge boundary, the impregnable boundary of India, the Himalayas. That has disappeared now, and today you have to guard your frontier across the Himalayas. These are new symptoms. Let us forget for the time being what is happening in the rest of the world. We will take intelligent interest when matters come up—Tunisia, Korea and other places—and undoubtedly we will make our contribution. But let us think of our home first, shaping our foreign policy in such a way that our home front can be properly strengthened, and if a crisis comes we will be able to rise to a man and stand up to it for defending the national honour and integrity of our motherland.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Since yesterday we have been discussing what is called Foreign Policy, and many aspects of it have been mentioned. We have discussed the Foreign Service, the failings or the virtues of our diplomatic personnel, the money we spend or the waste we indulge in or do not indulge in. We have also discussed other matters. I listened with respect and attention to the speeches that were being made and, if I may say so, the level of the debate since yesterday has been high.

As I listened today, the background of this tormented world came before me; because after all, when we talk about foreign policy, we talk about the world or bits of the world, or we talk of this world which for years has hung on the edge of a catastrophe. People talk of the success of our foreign policy. How they measure success and how they wish to achieve success in Ceylon or Goa, I would like to know. People have talked about the policy that our

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

Government has pursued as not yielding success or being driven into this camp or that camp, and that problems remain unsolved, whether it is in Kashmir or elsewhere. Some hon. Members have criticised our policy; but I have waited these two days for one concrete suggestion, a positive suggestion of what one can do, apart from what is being done.

Brave words! yes; forensic eloquence, yes; melodrama, yes; but what do you want us to do? I ask hon. Members to ponder over this question. There are many problems in the world today, whether you go to Korea, whether you go to Iran or Egypt or Tunisia or America or Germany, almost anywhere you go, there are problems, and every problem is an unsolved problem, because every problem is connected with the whole world situation in all its complexity and this whole world situation may sometimes take a turn for the better and sometimes for the worse, but as a whole, it presents a very tragic aspect. So, do you expect the solution of these problems? If I may say so with all respect, it means a total lack of comprehension of what the problem of the world is. Success may come, but I do not claim success. Our policy may have led to failure here and there. It is not that. But I do wish this House to consider the issue not from the point of view of debate or of eloquence but from the point of view of considering some of the most tremendous problems of the age; for it is a tremendous responsibility for anyone, whether it is an individual or a Government or this Parliament to have to face and consider these problems and to decide what we are to do about them. We cannot decide these problems. That is, shall I say, sheer arrogance for any of us to think that even this great country of India is going to decide the fate of the world. Of course, not. It may be, however, that we may make a difference, that we may help towards a decision, that we may make that final difference which may come between war and peace, and that will be a great service if we can do that to the world.

Therefore, I approach these problems in all humility. Hon. Members have talked about my whims and caprices which fashion our foreign policy. It is a small matter, how they refer to me; but it is not a small matter when they refer to the policy of this great nation as the whim and caprice of an individual, whoever he might be. It is not a fitting thing for us to say and it is not a fact. Our policy, as I have said repeatedly, has grown out of our past way of thinking and our declarations and I do say that we have stuck to those declarations and to those past ways of thinking. In so far as we can stick to them in the changed circumstances, we have stuck to them and those hon. Members who think otherwise are mistaken entirely and completely. I cannot and nobody can judge himself. It is for others to see, but so far as I can understand whatever we have stood for and whatever I personally stood for in the realm of international affairs, I have stuck to them to the uttermost limit without the slightest wavering or deviation to the right or left.

Personally, I am quite clear about that. Of course, I may be wrong; others may be better judges. Whether it is relation to the type of partnership or about our remaining in the Commonwealth, I wish to stick to every word I have uttered and those who make this charge do not understand what they are talking about or what I said then or what I say now. It is amazing how some hon. Members opposite with all their eloquence, with all their fine qualities have somehow lost all knowledge to understand the changed position. They are like the religious fundamentalists who will not see to the right or left but who will only go in one direction. The world may change but their mental habits and thoughts will not change. It does not matter to them whether it is morning, noon or night. Theirs is not to reason why or say anything. They will keep repeating the same slogan, the same everything, although the world may go on changing.

Take this business of peace. We all want peace, of course but unfortunately the great powers and the great blocs of nations today, they all talk peace and yet in some great countries peace is considered a dangerous word. If you talk of peace one almost suspects your loyalty. In other countries peace is talked about so much in such tones that they deafen and they almost sound like war. After all peace is not PEACE; it is a quality; it is a way of approach it is a way of doing things; it is the objective which you want to reach. If in talking of peace, you are preparing for war, then surely, there is something wrong in the peace you talk about. Are you going to get peace by meetings and by conferences? We have plenty of peace conferences nowadays. Perhaps some hon. Members may have seen an advertisement in England: "Join the British Navy and see the world." You might very well say: "Join the peace movement and have free trips over the world". There are conferences all the time and people are rushing backwards and forwards free of charge. I do not know who pays. All for the sake of peace they travel, suffer extreme discomforts and go to the uttermost ends of the earth. I do not understand this and I do not think it is dignified for people to rush about like this, Indians or anybody, at the cost of other people and other countries. But is this the way you are going to have peace? Are you going to have peace by merely shouting by the roadside and the market square "Peace, Peace", and banging other peoples' heads and saying "a person who does this will be punished"?

Surely, let us function as a mature people and as a mature nation. We are not children; we are not in a debating society to match each other's forensic skill, regardless of facts and regardless of what the effect of our words is. It is very easy to talk of anti-imperialism and that kind of thing. Imperialism does exist today, but I do venture to say that Imperialism, as it exists today, is something surely and absolutely different from what it was and about which some of the hon. Members talked. Let them understand what it is. Let them also understand that there are other Imperialisms growing. Take the British Imperialism. Does any man in this House think that British Imperialism is the same thing as it was in the past?

An Hon. Member: What about Malaya?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I know about Malaya and I say British imperialism flourishes in Malaya, in Africa and elsewhere but British Imperialism today is an exhausted thing. England is a country for which, I hope, this House has respect for the way it has fought its problems since the war was over, and for the courage with which it has faced them. It certainly and undoubtedly in many places does things with which this House or I do not agree. That is not the point. Let us see things in the historical perspective. To talk about the British power as it was before the last war, as if it was the same today, is either complete misunderstanding and ignorance of what is happening or trying to delude others. It is not so. Today, there are other powers, great powers, for good or ill. I repeat that for England, since those war years, I have nurtured considerable respect, because I like brave people fighting against odds and the British people have fought against great odds. That does not mean that I agree with England in this or in that. That is not the point. But to talk about British Imperialism today in the same context as of old is to talk about something which does not exist.

I will go a step further and take other countries. There are still some imperial powers, colonial powers. Undoubtedly, all these colonies should be put an end to, whether they are British or French or Dutch or Belgian or any other. I quite agree. But the position today nevertheless remains that all these colonial powers have no strength behind them. They have the strength of tradition; they have the strength of being helped by other people, and all manner of things. But, they have inherently no strength. Let us certainly by all means help in putting an end to the remaining elements of colonialism in Asia, in Africa, wherever it is. Let us understand what the real conflict is about today. Let us understand this marshalling of forces. Let us understand that if the conflict once takes place, then the whole world will be mightily changed, and whatever the change may be, the change will not be for the good because of the uttermost destruction and the rest of it. Therefore, that does not do much good. Let us analyse each problem by itself. It does not help in the slightest to repeat the slogans of yesterday, thinking that they take the place of thought and action. It is a complicated, difficult, tormented world today. All we can do is to approach these problems with great humility, not with a certitude of success—I have none—and try to help where we can, try to be good, try to put in a good word and try to avoid evil at any rate, and try to go ahead faster where you have the chance to do so.

It is all very well to talk bravely even about small matters. It does not become people to be brave, to be melodramatic and [illegible] this hon. House as if it was a meeting in the Ram Lila Grounds in Delhi. We are the Parliament of India talking about great problems; we should not put on melodramatic poses and forensic attitudes, repeating the slogans of the market place here. A high responsibility rests on us. So I beg this House to consider the foreign policy, not in terms of petty success, not in terms of failure; because the success or failure of foreign policy today of every country is involved in the success or failure of this world of ours. No man can say whether this world will survive peacefully for the next few years or will not. No man can say what will happen if disaster comes to it. It just does not matter what your policy or my policy is. When disaster comes, it comes to the world. It is true that even so, our policy should be, firstly to prevent that disaster, secondly to avoid it, and thirdly, even if it comes, to retain a position in which we are able to stop it even after it has started.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

I want to be perfectly frank with this House. I should like an ever-widening area in this world, an ever-widening area of countries in Asia which decide that they will not enter the war whatever happens. I should like the countries in Asia, and other countries also,—I speak about our neighbours—I should like the countries in Asia to make it clear to those warring factions, those great countries who are so much exercised by passion against each other, that they will remain cool and, whatever happens, they will not enter the arena of warfare and that they will try at least to restrict the war to other regions and save their regions and try to save the rest. I should like also, in so far as we can, to declare ourselves and get other countries to declare against the use of these horrible modern weapons. You have heard of the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb which has not exactly come into existence but which is said to be far worse. Hon. Members talked about bacteriological warfare and have expected Government, if I may say so, to function as if it was an organisation which rushes in and expresses its opinions like hon. Members do, without taking the trouble to find out exactly what to say, when to say it, and what weight to attach to anything. Governments do not function in that way. Governments weigh their words; Governments weigh the evidence. Governments do not go about condemning people or nations until they are absolutely convinced. Even when Governments feel that there is adequate evidence, they cannot do so till the proper moment comes or till they are quite satisfied about it. We should undoubtedly, and I think nations should raise their voice against any application of germ or bacteriological warfare in any country. Take something which has been used in the recent past; some kind of grenade or something like that, the Napalam bomb, a horrible thing. All these things are there.

But how are you going to put a stop to this drift towards catastrophe and disaster? . It is not an easy matter. When the world is worked up by passion and prejudice, one thing I am dead certain is that you do not put an end to it by yourself joining that crowd of passionate and excited people shouting at the top of their voice. That does not help. It merely increases the din and increases the passion. It does not matter if the word you shout is peace. Even then, it increases the din and shouting. You have to be a little quiet and go about speaking to smaller voices so that it could be heard by more people. You have to try somehow to make the people less excited. You may be convinced that you are right. But, if it is your object, not merely to show off that you are right and that you are very strong about being right, but to gain results in the world, to calm down others, to prevent them from fighting, you have to set about winning them over. You have to see about winning them over even though they are in the wrong, not by going and telling them that they are bad, very bad and that they should be punished and crushed. That is not the way of calming them and winning anybody over. I do not mean to say that we should not condemn the wrong. We should. But, I have not been taught that it is civilized behaviour among individuals, much less among nations, to go about condemning people. It is far better to talk about our own weaknesses than point out others' weaknesses and others' failings.

So. I submit that this is my approach to foreign policy. You may call it neutral or you may call it whatever you like. I do not see where neutrality comes in in this picture at all. It is not neutrality. The word neutrality is completely wrong except in times of war. There is no neutrality except when there is a war. If you think there is a war on today, we are neutral. If you think there is a cold war today, certainly we are neutral. We are not going to indulge in cold war which, if I may say so, is in some ways worse than shooting war. A shooting war is infinitely disastrous; but this is worse in the sense that it is more degraded. It lowers the standards all the time. We do not propose to join that war. It does not matter who is right and who is wrong. We will not join in this exhibition of mutual abuse.

Now, there are so many subjects which have been referred to in the course of this debate. I do not wish to get, if I may say so, rather lost in this maze of subjects, but there are one or two major aspects which I should like to put to this House. There has been repeated reference to our inclining more and more towards what is called the Anglo-American bloc. Now, it is perfectly true that our economic and some other bonds have been in the last few years far more with the United Kingdom, with the United States of America and other countries of the West That is something that we have inherited, and unless we put an end to this and develop some other bonds, somewhere else, we have to continue them. Obviously we had to continue them. We could not live in isolation. We wanted certain things. We could not get them from elsewhere. So, in normal practice, any country would continue those. We had to continue them; we propose to continue them. I see no reason at all except the passion and prejudice of somebody who does not like it. I see no reason at all why we should break any bond which is of advantage to us.

Now, it is true that where a country begins to depend upon another country, there is always a danger and risk. Dependence is always bad, whatever form that dependence might take, and one should be guarded about it. And yet a country, placed as India is today, and many other countries, inevitably depends on other countries for certain essential things. We are not industrialised enough. We do not produce important things. We talk about our Army, Navy and Air Force, and yet we have to depend upon other countries for the major things that an Army or an Air Force or a Navy requires. We are dependent. Hon. Members talk about a big army. It does not matter in the least how big an army you have, if you do not have the equipment for the Army. It does not matter, in the ultimate analysis, how many people you train up unless you have got the entire background for that army in the country. Well, we try to build that up as far as we can. Till we build it up, what are we to do? We have got to get the essential things from abroad from one country or other, from everywhere. It is not good to rely on any one country; and to begin with, we have got to do things which are necessary to build up basic industries in this country. Now, we have tried to get them from certain countries because it was easier to get them from there, because of our economic contacts there, because our trade and commerce are in those channels. It is all very well to suggest other channels. It is very difficult for us to build new channels overnight. We are perfectly prepared to have new channels with other countries; we are perfectly prepared to deal with the Soviet Union or other countries which can supply us with the particular goods we need and supply them with our goods. But the fact remains that it is simpler for us, easier for us, to get things from America or England or France or other countries at the moment.

Take our defence services. We have inherited them. They have been built up after a certain model. Now, we may change that model later on or not. It is a good model so far as it goes, *i.e.*, our defence services are efficient, our army is a good one. Inevitably it has been built up in the British way, because the British started it and built it up for a large number of years. Now, do you expect us to break it up and start building up afresh? I can understand the argument that the army should be made more and more popular. That I can understand. Let us consider it by all means, let us explore it. But, you want us to break up this magnificent fighting unit that we have got today built up on a certain model just to show off our dissatisfaction with the fact that the British built it up or that it rather approximates to the British model of an Army. That would be childish. We have to keep it going as it is. And because we have got to keep it going—we can gradually change it or make it after our own way, whatever it is,—we have to get the equipment for it. Inevitably it is easier for us to get the equipment from certain sources which can supply that equipment than it is to get entirely new types of equipment, entirely new types of arms which do not fit in even with the arms we are producing in this country. That will create all kinds of difficulties.

Some hon. Member said: Why do you get British advisers? Why not get a German or Japanese or somebody else? Well, certainly; but things are not done in that way. It is not a question of getting odd people to come and advise us in an odd manner. Here is a machine working in a particular way, and you have to work it apart from everything else. You cannot mix up people or advisers thinking on different lines, different equipment, different types of munitions, coming here and quarrelling with each other while they advise us. We must follow a single system till we change it.

The House will remember that we attained independence in a co-operative way, ultimately in a friendly way, with the British power, and I think history will record that to our credit, and to England's credit—I am not ashamed to say to England's credit also. Having done that we went step by step. The House will remember that for the first two years while we were formulating our Constitution, we were a Dominion. But from the very first day our Constituent Assembly met, we declared that our objective was a Republic. That was in December 1946. And as soon as our Constitution was completed and given effect to, we became the Republic of India. Later, the question arose about our being in the Commonwealth or not. Now, is it not a very different thing for the Republic of India which has nothing to do with England constitutionally, legally or in any other way except such normal bonds as two countries may have in the economic sphere or in the cultural sphere, whatever it may be, to decide to remain associated

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

with England or with a group of countries without the least inhibition, without the least binding factor in it? I should like hon. Members to point out to me—the hon. Member Dr. Mookerjee who was himself in the Cabinet when these questions were considered said that the time had come for us to do this or that or to leave the Commonwealth—In what way, at any time, at any moment, during the last three or four years, the fact of our being associated with the Commonwealth has affected our policy, has varied it this way or that in the slightest degree. I should like to know that. I say, therefore, it becomes purely a question, if I may say so, of acting in a sentimental huff. I must say nations do not act either on sentiment or in a huff. They act with dignity and strength, and considering what is the right course, they adopt it and go by it. Now, it is open to our country as it is to any other to be associated in an alliance with any other country We have avoided alliances which entangle us. Dr. Lanka Sundaram referred to a number of Treaties of Friendship which we have entered into and pointed out some minor differences in phraseology. I hope hon. Members will excuse me if I do not go into these rather trivial points, because they have no importance whatsoever. So far as we are concerned, we are prepared to enter into a treaty of friendship for ever with every country in the world. It is open to us to enter into any alliance with any country. In an alliance, invariably you give something and you take something. Each country binds itself down to a certain extent If you put it this way, it gives up the freedom of action to the extent to which it is committed by an alliance or an agreement. That is not coming in the way of the independence of that country.

Our association with the Commonwealth is rather remarkable. It does not bind ourselves down in the slightest degree in any way whatever, and it has not had that effect during these last two or three years either. It has given us certain advantages, and it has not meant any disadvantages in the slightest degree. I should like hon. Members to point out to me now or later how and in what way it has been disadvantageous, except in the way that they just do not like the look of it. I cannot help their likes and dislikes. We are concerned with the advantages to our country. And if I am told "See what is happening in Ceylon or in South Africa, they are in the Commonwealth and yet you put up with this kind of thing," then I venture to say that that is the very reason I remain there. May I explain it? I do not want this Commonwealth to be an interfering Commonwealth. I shall say what the Commonwealth means to me. It means an occasional meeting together once a year or twice a year. It means occasional consultation and reference to each other. It means certain advantages which I get by being able to influence larger policies, apart from the normal method of doing so. Otherwise it does not come in my way at all.

Now, if I admitted the right of the Commonwealth to interfere with any country in the Commonwealth, then I cease to be in the Commonwealth at all, I am not prepared for their saying anything to me, I am not prepared to accept anything from them at all. It is very important and clear that the Commonwealth, or whatever it is, is some kind of an unsubstantial thing, unknown in any other constitution. But what we have to consider is: in the balance, is it advantageous for us or disadvantageous? I am perfectly clear in my mind that in no sense at all does it come in our way, in any policy, political, economic, peace or war. If any hon. Member seems to think that we have got some kind of common war or defence policies, allow me to assure them that they are completely mistaken. We have never discussed defence policies in the Commonwealth, either jointly or separately.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): But why did you allow the Commander-in-Chief to go to London?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Our Commander-in-Chief goes to London to take part sometimes in what are called 'military exercises'. Perhaps the hon. Member does not understand these things.

Shri Nambiar: I am prepared to be understood.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I shall again repeat that our system, our army's model is inevitably after the British system. It helps us as we want things from England We have got a very big military stores department in London. We have to keep it up because the same type of things have to come to us; we have sometimes to get them through the good offices of the British War Office. Our Commander-in-Chief goes there in order to consider these matters. Our commanders do not discuss policies, ministers discuss policies. But the real thing is, if I may draw the attention of the House to this, in many matters we have inherited certain ways from the British period and we can decide either to reject them or accept them. We have given up many; we have decided to keep many till we change them as we want to change them.

Now one of the things we have inherited, to the use of which hon. Members opposite have not objected to, and it is a sign, if I may say so, of mental subservience about which we are repeatedly told, is the English language. I have not heard any word of protest from the Opposition benches to the use of the English language. I have not heard being told that we are subservient to the Anglo-American bloc because we are using their language all the time here. I have no doubt at all that English language is the greatest thing which ties us to the Anglo-American bloc. The English language inevitably brings nearer to us their thoughts, their activities, their books, newspapers, cultural standards; while the rest of the world with which we are not acquainted linguistically is cut off from us. It is a sad thing. I should like our country, apart from developing our own language, of course, to know other languages of the world, so that we may develop and come into contact with them. And here it is a strange fact that some hon. Members opposite object to every thing, to even those things that are advantageous to us, because they happen to emanate from America or England or some country in the West, but they swallow wholesale the English language which is the real and ultimate bond which has tied us to them mentally and otherwise. I have no objection to the use of the English language, of course. I do not mean anything against it. But my argument was that we have inherited certain things, and it is not a good thing to break a good thing, to upset something that is good. We change it because we have decided, for instance, to change it gradually in our country during the next few years and to use our own language ultimately and fully. I hope English will remain even after that, not as a language we use in our official way, but because it is a great language. I hope other world languages will come in too here. That is all right. But this general approach of suspecting everything that comes from England or America is not helpful at all. I submit that it will be found that whatever step we have taken in foreign policy and many other subjects may have been wrong in a small way, but whatever step we have taken has always been measured by this rod, whether it helps India's interests and whether it helps the course of world's peace.

We have often expressed ourselves in a way that displeased the great nations and filled them with anger, but we have preferred that to going any other way. Hon. Members are acquainted with recent history, how great nations have changed their allegiance rather suddenly; how they have had alliances and how enemies have come together and become allies and then enemies again. Even in the course of the last great war, the Soviet Union was allied to Nazi Germany; a little later it was attached by Nazi Germany and it fought with enormous endurance and courage against Hitler's armies. Now, I am not condemning any country; I am merely pointing out that at that time the rulers of the Soviet Union thought it right and desirable to have a close alliance with a country which previously they had condemned and which they were to fight a little later and fight to the death also. Now, I have not heard all the predecessors of the hon. Members opposite in their organisation ever criticising that as they might well have done.

Pandit Balkrishna Sharma: That was the Fatherland. How could they?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: There is one difficulty that I have to face and that is that I am liable to error. Very much so. All I can do is to try to avoid it. I think any of us is liable to error. When I am approached from the point of view of infallibility of an organisation, an idea, a country, then I rebel against that. I think any such idea may yield results for the time being, but ultimately it is fatal to the growth of a nation; it curbs the spirit and the mind and stunts the community. So judge the present day difficulties of the world not from the point of view of inevitably some country being right or wrong. Judge of each point separately; and secondly, do not indulge in vilification of any country. It does not help. Let us certainly point out, when the situation demands our pointing out, that a policy is wrong or something else should be done; but merely to go about slanging other countries does not create the atmosphere for the peace that we desire.

So I submit that so far as our policy is concerned, in spite of the fact that we deal largely with the United Kingdom or the USA—we buy our things from them and we have accepted help from them—we have not swerved at all from our policy of not aligning with any group. And, if I may say so, it is because we stuck to that policy and, in doing so, were denied help and still we stuck to that policy, that people realised and countries realised that we could not be bought by money or made to change our policy. It was then—not because we went begging for it, we have not done so at any time—that help came to us and we gladly accepted it; and we

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

shall accept it all the time provided there are no strings, provided our policy is perfectly clear and above board and is not affected by it. I realise—I frankly admit—that there are always certain risks involved; not risks on paper but risks in the sense that certain obligations might be felt which might affect our policy without our knowing it. These risks are there. All I can say is that we should be wide awake and try to avoid our committing any mistake because of these risks. If the Government at all makes a mistake, this House, I am sure, will pull it up.

We have no big armies and we are no great power. The next generation will no doubt, I hope, be stronger than us, but even in the present generation which I represent, we may make many mistakes. But we have not known to bow down to threats. We have spent our lives in resistance. A word from us would have brought us many of the good things of life. We refused to give that; we preferred not to give it, not we, a few individuals, but millions in this country. So if, any country imagines that we are going to change our policies and sell ourselves for a mess of pottage from any other country, it is, I submit, completely mistaken. I am quite sure in my mind that if at any time any help from abroad depends upon the slightest variation of our policy, we shall give up that help, the whole of it, and prefer starvation and everything to it. So it is in this way that we accept help and, I think, the world knows it well enough.

Now there is one other aspect to which I should like to refer to. Dr. Lanka Sundaram asked whether a Standing Committee of the Ministry of External Affairs was going to be constituted. Well, Standing Committees were constituted in the old British days in a peculiar way for a special purpose. As they were constituted, they serve no useful purpose now. I do not know if it will be appointed—that is a matter for the House to decide—but I should like to assure this House and specially the Opposition that as Minister for Foreign Affairs I should gladly welcome frequent consultations with them and talks with them about any matter appertaining to foreign affairs. We can think about it and evolve some method, not only discuss the general international position, but discuss specific problems as they arise.

Now in the larger world today we have associated ourselves with the United Nations. Our association with the United Nations does not take away from our independence. But to a certain extent it does, if I may say so, as it does of every member country, because once you limit your field of action by joining an organisation like that, to that extent your independence is limited just as other alliances limit it. It is just a mutual limitation. It is a far greater limitation than our being vaguely associated with the Commonwealth of Nations—with England and others. There is nothing in that at all. In fact, it is almost an airy association because it is not written down on paper or Constitution or anywhere; so long as we wish to be there, we are there.

To come back to the United Nations, we associated ourselves with the United Nations because we felt that some such world organisation was essential. The League of Nations had failed. Here was another attempt under wider and perhaps better auspices and we joined it. And, I think that the Charter of the United Nations is still a very fine and noble document. An hon. Member used the words "go and scrap the Charter". I do not understand that. I think the Charter is a very fine thing. But it is true and I feel it more and more that the Charter is not being lived upto; that the United Nations somehow swerved away from the basic provisions of that Charter in theory as well as in practice. And I think that is a very serious matter for us and for other countries to consider.

There was the Atlantic Pact of certain Western Atlantic countries. It is not my concern as to what certain countries do for their defence. We cannot as a Government come into the picture or object to anything that they do. But there is one aspect of that Atlantic Pact which has been coming into evidence more and more. Whether it is the formal aspect of it or just an informal one, I do not know. But it began—this community of Atlantic nations—as a defence against aggression. Well, no one can object to that. It has extended itself apparently as a defence of the colonial possessions of those nations and that is a very serious matter so far as we are concerned. It means various countries giving assurances, whether formal or informal, for the protection and maintenance of colonial rule wherever it exists. Now, to colonial rule wherever it might exist, we are, as you know, unalterably opposed.

So I wish to point that out to hon. Members of this House that we have taken a serious view of this as we took a very serious view of the denial of a discussion in the Security Council on the Tunisian question. Apart from the merits of the Tunisian question, it is an amazing thing that nearly every country of Asia and many countries of Africa are wanting a discussion—a consideration—of the Tunisian issue, apart from the determination of it, and this is being denied and denied by two countries voting against it. Now, that is a very extraordinary state of affairs. If the whole of Asia and Africa combined cannot get a subject discussed in the Security Council because two or three great Powers object to it, well then, a time may well come when those countries of Asia and Africa might feel that they are happier in their own countries and not in the United Nations. That would be a tragic decision; because I do feel that in spite of these faults, the United Nations serve an essential purpose and if we did not have it today, undoubtedly countries will have to come together to build up something like it again. I do not want that to happen. I do attach the greatest importance to the United Nations, but I repeat the way the United Nations have swerved from its original moorings and become gradually a protector of colonialism in this indirect way is a dangerous deviation and also how slowly instead of being a great organisation for peace, some of the members have begun to think of it more and more as an organisation for waging war. Now that was not the conception behind the United Nations and though the old Charter remains, somehow facts begin to belie it more and more. We have ventured to point this out to the member countries of the United Nations and I think that our words have created some effect in their minds. I mention this to this House because inevitably the action we take from time to time, whether in regard to a particular issue, whatever it may be and whatever country might be involved, or whether it is the larger issue of world peace, is not shouted from the market place. We are a responsible Government dealing with other Governments and if we shout in public, the whole effect of our approach goes. That is not the way modern diplomacy is carried on. Because we do not shout, the hon. Members opposite might perhaps think that we remain supine; apparently their idea of diplomacy is the holding of public meetings and the passing of big resolutions—big banners and big flags of a particular type.

Yes, I mentioned just now a flag and my mind goes back to the incident that took place a few days ago. Hon. Members have referred to the putting up of the Union Jack some days ago over this Parliament building. Some two or three years ago the matter came before us and we decided that as a matter of courtesy, on a certain day in the year, we would allow the Union Jack to be put up on one of our essential buildings like the Secretariat. It was no request to us from anybody else. It was a matter of courtesy. We gave instructions. There was no question at that time of putting up the flag on the Parliament House as the Parliament was not sitting and I must confess that when I saw the flag on the Parliament House, I was myself a little surprised because I had expected it to be on the Secretariat building and not on Parliament House. But the instructions given two years ago were not properly understood by the person in charge and the flag was put up on the Parliament House. I do feel that while it is perfectly right for us to show courtesy and to put up the Union Jack, I do believe that over Parliament House no flag but the Indian flag should be put up (*Hear, hear*) and instructions have been issued to that effect.

May I also say one word about the situation in Korea? I am not at the moment referring to the truce negotiations which have gone on for such a long time, although they are exceedingly important and one might say that the future of not only the Far East but of the world depends on what turn those negotiations take; and it seems an amazing tragedy that we should get stuck up there month after month and year after year. So far as we are concerned we have not been completely out of the picture in the sense that we have tried to keep in touch with the major parties concerned. We had special opportunities of doing so and we had played some part in this in the hope that perhaps some way of bringing about peace might be found. But I should like to say that I have been deeply concerned at certain internal developments in South Korea. We have nothing to do with South Korea. We have never recognised the Government of South Korea. So it is not our concern. Nevertheless, indirectly, because we are members of the United Nations and the United Nations is functioning in South Korea, it is a matter of concern to us what happens there. And the recent developments connected with the activities of President Syngman Rhee are not only very remarkable, but, I think, should make the United Nations and every country connected with it think of the undesirability of any association with a person like President Rhee who functions in that way. Any support of the regime of President Rhee means the support of the very things which the United Nations is supposed to stand against.

Shri Nambiar: Withdraw the medical mission.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The Medical mission has not gone to President Rhee.

I am sorry that I cannot deal with the large number of matters referred to, but I hope, either in this House or elsewhere, to deal with the other matters which hon. Members have mentioned here. I am grateful for the indulgence of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The House is not rising immediately. There are these cut motions. Hon. Members ought not to rise when I am on my legs. I am really surprised that in spite of my repeated warnings and the warnings of the hon. the Speaker, hon. Members do not observe this decorum. What is the great hurry? The business of the House is not over immediately. It is not as if scorpions were menacing them. Hon. Members must remain here. When they take interest in such important and serious matters as these, they must have the patience to remain in the House.

Dr. Lanka Sundaram: Some hon. Members went away because they apparently do not want to vote.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let them show greater courage.

Now, I shall put Cut Motion No. 420 by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri to the House. The question is:

> "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The House divided: Ayes, 72; *Noes,* 296.

Division No. 4] AYES **[1-9 p.m.**

Achalu, Shri
Ajit Singh, Shri
Bahadur Singh, Shri
Banerjee, Shri
Basu, Shri K. K.
Boovaraghasamy, Shri
Buchhikotaiah, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri N. C.
Chatterjea, Shri Tushar
Chattopadhyaya, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri T. K.
Chowdary, Shri C. R.
Chowdhury, Shri N. B.
Damodaran, Shri N. P.
Das, Shri B. C.
Das, Shri Sarangadhar
Deo, Shri R. N.
Deshpande, Shri V. G.
Doraswamy, Shri
Gam Malludora, Shri
Girdhari Bhoi, Shri
Gurupadaswamy, Shri
Hukam Singh, Shri
Jayaraman, Shri
Kachiroyar, Shri
Kandasamy, Shri
Kripalani, Shrimati Sucheta
Mahata, Shri B.
Majhi, Shri Chaitan
Mangalagiri, Shri
Menon, Shri Damodara
Mishra, Pandit S. C.
Missir, Shri V.
Mookerjee, Dr. S. P.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
More, Shri S. S.
Muniswamy, Shri
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Mushar, Shri
Naidu, Shri N. R.
Nambiar, Shri
Narasimham, Shri S. V. L.
Nathani, Shri H. R.
Pandey, Dr. Natabar
Punnoose, Shri
Raghabachari, Shri
Raghavaiah, Shri
Ramnarayan Singh, Babu
Randaman Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Gopala
Rao, Shri K. S.
Rao, Shri P. Subba
Rao, Shri Vittal
Reddi, Shri Madhao
Reddi, Shri Ramachandra
Reddy, Shri Eswara
Rishang Keishing, Shri
Saha, Shri Meghnad
Shakuntala, Shrimati
Sharma, Shri Nand Lal
Shastri, Shri B. D.
Singh, Shri R. N.
Subrahmanyam, Shri K.
Sundaram, Dr. Lanka
Swamy, Shri N. R. M.
Trivedi, Shri U. M.
Vallatharas, Shri
Veeraswami, Shri
Velayudhan, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Waghmare, Shri

NOES

Abdus Sattar, Shri
Achal Singh, Seth
Achint Ram, Lala
Achuthan, Shri
Agarwal, Prof.
Agarawal, Shri H.L.
Agrawal, Shri M.L.
Ajit Singhji, General
Akarpuri, Sardar
Alagesan, Shri
Altekar, Shri
Alva, Shri Joachim
Amrit Kaur, Rajkumari
Asthana, Shri
Badan Singh, Ch.
Balkrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Bansal, Shri
Barman, Shri
Barupal, Shri
Basappa, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhakta Darshan, Shri
Bhandari, Shri
Bhartiya, Shri S. R.
Bhargava, Pandit M. B.
Bhargava, Pandit Thakur Das
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhatt, Shri C. S.
Bhawani Singh, Shri
Bhawanji, Shri
Bheekha Bhai, Shri
Bidari, Shri
Birbal Singh, Shri

Borooah, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brohmo-Choudhury, Shri
Buragohain, Shri
Chacko, Shri P. T.
Chanda, Shri Anil K.
Chandak, Shri
Chandrasekhar, Shrim
Charak, Shri
Chatterjee, Dr. Susilranjan
Chaturvedi, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri G. L.
Chaudhury, Shri R. K.
Chavda, Shri
Chettiar, Shri T. S. A.
Cinaria, Shri
Cabhi, Shri
Damodaran, Shri G. R.
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B.
Das, Shri Beli Ram
Das, Shri K. K.
Das, Shri Ram Dhani
Das, Shri Ramananda
Das, Shri S. N.
Das, Shri N. T.
Deb, Shri S. C.
Desai, Shri K. N.
Deshmukh, Shri C. D.
Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
Deshpande, Shri G. H
Dholakia, Shri
Dhulekar, Shri
Dhusiya, Shri
Digambar Singh, Shri
Dube, Shri Mulchand
Dube, Shri U. S.
Dutta, Shri S. K.
Dwivedi, Shri D. P.
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Ebenezer, Dr.
Elayaperumal, Shri
Fotedar, Pandit
Gadgil, Shri
Gandhi, Shri Feroze
Gandhi, Shri M. M.
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ganpati Ram, Shri
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Ghulam Qader, Shri
Giri, Shri V. V.
Gohain, Shri
Gounder, Shri K. S.
Govind Das, Seth
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Badshah
Hari Mohan, Dr.
Hazarika, Shri J.N.
Heda, Shri
Hem Raj, Shri
Hembrom, Shri
Ibrahim, Shri
Islamuddin, Shri M.
Iyyani, Shri E.
Iyyunni, Shri C. R.
Jagjivan Ram, Shri
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jain, Shri N. S.
Jajware, Shri
Jangde, Shri
Jasani, Shri
Jatav-vir, Shri
Jayashri, Shrimati
Jena, Shri K. C.
Jena, Shri Niranjan
Jethan, Shri
Jha, Shri Bhagwat
Jhunjhunwala, Shri
Joshi, Shri Jethalal
Joshi, Shri Liladhar
Joshi, Shri M. D.
Joshi, Shri N. L.
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Jwala Prashad, Shri
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kakkan, Shri
Kale, Shrimati A.
Kamble, Shri
Kanungo, Shri
Kasliwal, Shri
Katham, Shri
Katju, Dr.
Keshavaiengar, Shri
Keskar, Dr.
Khedkar, Shri G. B.
Khuda Baksh, Shri M.
Kirolikar, Shri
Krishna Chandra, Shri
Krishnamachari, Shri T. T.
Krishnappa, Shri M. V.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lallanji, Shri
Lakshmayya, Shri
Laskar, Prof.
Lotan Ram, Shri
Madiah Gowda, Shri
Mahodaya, Shri
Mahtab, Shri
Maitra, Pandit L. K.
Majhi, Shri R. C.
Majithia, Sardar
Malliah, Shri U. S.
Malvia, Shri B. N.
Malviya, Pandit C. N.
Mandal, Dr. P.
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mathew, Prof.
Matthen, Shri
Maydeo, Shrimati
Mehta, Shri Balwant Sinha
Mehta, Shri B. G.
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mishra, Shri Lokenath
Mishra, Shri M. P.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Misra, Pandit Lingaraj
Misra, Shri B. N.
Misra, Shri R. D.
Misra, Shri S. P.
Mohd. Akbar, Sofi
Mohiuddin, Shri
Morarka, Shri
More, Shri K. L.
Muchaki Kosa, Shri
Musafir, Giani G. S.
Muthukrishnan, Shri
Nair, Shri C. K.
Narasimhan, Shri C. R.
Natawadkar, Shri
Nathwani, Shri N. P.
Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal
Nehru, Shrimati Uma
Nesamony, Shri
Nevatia, Shri
Pannalal, Shri
Pant, Shri D. D.
Patikh, Shri S. G.
Parmar, Shri R. B.
Patel, Shri B. K.
Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
Patel, Shrimati Maniben
Pawar, Shri V. P.
Pillai, Shri Thanu
Pocker Saheb, Shri
Prabhakar, Shri N.
Prasad, Shri H. S.
Rachiah, Shri N.
Radha Raman, Shri
Raghubir Sahai, Shri
Raghubir Singh, Ch.
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raghuramaiah, Shri
Raj Bahadur, Shri
Ram Das, Shri
Ram Saran, Prof.
am Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ram anand Shastri, Swami
Ramaswamy, Shri P.
Ramaswamy, Shri S. V.
Ranbir Singh, Ch.
Rao, Diwan Raghavendra
Rao, Shri B. Shiva
Rao, Shri Rajagopala
Raut, Shri Bhola
Razmi, Shri S. K.
Reddy, Shri H. S.
Reddy, Shri Viswanatha
Richardson, Bishop
Roy, Shri B. N.
Rup Narain, Shri
Saigal, Sardar A. S.
Saksena, Shri Mohanlal
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Sanganna, Shri
Sankarapandian, Shri
Sarmah, Shri
Satish Chandra, Shri

Satyawadi, Dr.
Sen, Shri P. G.
Sen, Shrimati Sushama
Sewal, Shri A. R.
Shah, Shri R. B.
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri
Sharma, Pandit Balkrishna
Sharma, Pandit K. C.
Sharma, Prof. D. C.
Sharma, Shri K. R.
Sharma, Shri R. C.
Shobha Ram, Shri
Shukla, Pandit B.
Sidhananjappa, Shri
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singh, Shri Babunath
Singh, Shri G. S.
Singh, Shri H. P.
Singh, Shri L. J.
Singh, Shri M. N.
Singh, Shri T. N.
Singhal, Shri S. C.
Sinha, Dr. S. N.
Sinha, Shri A. P.
Sinha, Shri Anirudha
Sinha, Shri B. P.
Sinha, Shri C. N. P.
Sinha, Shri Jhulan
Sinha, Shri K. P.
Sinha, Shri N. P.
Sinha, Shri S.
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Siva, Dr. Gangadhara
Snatak, Shri
Sodhia, Shri K. C.
Somana, Shri N.
Subrahmanyam, Shri T.
Suresh Chandra, Dr.
Swami, Shri Sivamurthi
Swaminadhan, Shrimati Ammu
Syed Ahmed, Shri
Syed Mahmud, Dr.
Tek Chand, Shri
Telkikar, Shri
Tewari, Sardar R. B. S.
Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tivari, Shri V. N.
Tiwari, Pandit B. L.
Tiwari, Shri R. S.
Tivary, Pandit D. N.
Tandon, Shri P. D.
Tripathi, Shri H. V.
Tripathi, Shri V. D
Tudu, Shri B. L.
Uikey, Shri
Upadhyay, Shri M. D
Upadhyay, Shri Shiva Daya
Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
Vaishnav, Shri H. G.
Vaishya, Shri M. B.
Varma, Shri B. B.
Varma, Shri B. R.
Vartak, Shri
Venkataraman, Shri
Vidyalankar, Shri
Vijaya Lakshmi, Shrimati
Vishwanath Prasad, Shri
Wilson, Shri J. N.
Wodeyar, Shri
Zaidi, Col.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall now place all the other cut motions before the House. The question is:

(i) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(ii) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(iii) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(iv) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(v) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

(vi) "That the demand under the head 'External Affairs' be reduced by Rs. 100."

The motions were negatived.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the third column of the order paper in respect of Demands Nos. 22, 23 and 24 be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of the corresponding heads of Demands entered in the second column thereof."

The motion was adopted.

[*As directed by Mr. Deputy-Speaker the motions for Demands for grants which were adopted by the House are reproduced below*—Ed. of P.P.]

DEMAND NO. 22—TRIBAL AREAS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,96,95,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Tribal Areas'."

DEMAND NO. 23—EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,55,94,000 be granted to the President, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'External Affairs'."

DEMAND NO. 24—MISCELLANEOUS EXPENDITURE UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS.

"That a sum exceeding Rs. 3,35,000 be granted to the president, out of the Consolidated Fund of India to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1953, in respect of 'Miscellaneous Expenditure under the Ministry of External Affairs'."

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on **Friday,** *the 13th June*, 1952.